E 431
.T15

NATIONAL POLITICS.

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALBERT G. TALBOTT,

OF KENTUCKY,

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JULY 28, 1856,

Defining his Position on Know Nothingism, Black Republicanism, and Democracy.

The House being in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union—

Mr. TALBOTT said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In a few remarks I had the honor to submit on a former occasion, I stated that I had been elected to a seat upon this floor as an independent Whig. I stated then, also, the platform of principles upon which I was elected, and to which I stood pledged to all parties, and to the country. I take occasion now to reassert and reindorse the same platform of principles, for by them I am willing to stand or fall. I had no time then, under the operation of the ten-minute rule, to elaborate and enforce them; and I rise now to ask the indulgence of the committee to vindicate and justify the positions then assumed—to define more clearly my own position—to indicate my future political course, and contrast, briefly, the relative positions of the different political parties now in the country. I desire, also, Mr. Chairman, to respond to some of the remarks made by my honorable colleague [Mr. Cox] a few evenings since. In doing this, I will be necessarily compelled to say something about Whiggery and Democracy, freedom and slavery, Know Nothingism and Black Republicanism; and I invite the attention of gentlemen of all the political parties in the House, especially that of my honorable colleague.

I do not rise, Mr. Chairman, to discuss the exciting questions now before the country in a spirit of vituperation, or with a heart overflowing with personal rancor and sectional ill-will, to engage in crimination and recrimination. Of that, I think, we have had quite enough already. I would rather, if I could, wipe out—obliterate forever—every offensive word, either personal or sectional, that has been uttered on this floor, and say something, if I knew what, that would cause the members of this Congress to flow together, and legislate, as did our fathers, like a band of brothers. And why not, Mr. Chairman? Why not we live, harmonize, and triumph together, as did our fathers? We have the same high privileges to enjoy, the same great interests to maintain, that were enjoyed and maintained by them. They had all the same institutions, political, social, and domestic, to regulate, that we have. They had all the same population to control, native-born, naturalized, and foreign, that we have. They had all the same religions—Protestant and Roman Catholic, to tolerate and provide for, that we have. And yet, sir, they did not disagree: they could live, and legislate, and harmonize together. They drew no invidious distinctions between Protestants and Roman Catholics—between native-born and naturalized citizens. In peace they lived and loved together: in war they fought and bled for each other. The foe was a common foe, and the army of defense united. They preserved harmony by providing for every section; they maintained the Union by the equality of rights; they prevented intolerance by the freedom of religion; they sustained the Government by doing justice to all. And thus, without dissension, without division, and without revolution, they led us on from weakness to strength, and from greatness to glory, until, by their wisdom, diplomacy, and peaceful government, they have won for us a place and a name in the rank of nations the most elevated and enviable in the world. And shall we now, by our dissensions and discords about slavery and religion, nativeism and foreignism, in a spirit of intolerance, suffer ourselves to be lashed into a state of frensy, and precipitated into a *senseless*, *suicidal*, *civil war*, and thus prove ourselves less competent to maintain and enjoy, than our fathers were to provide, preserve, and transmit to us, this glorious inheritance—our free institutions? No, Mr. Chairman, I have not risen for any purpose of crimination—not in a spirit of vituperation, but of conciliation. I would not say a word which, if I knew it, would add one iota to the already too excited state of feeling here and in the country. Vituperation, denunciation, and detraction, in my judgment, prove nothing to be either true or false.

I am not for war, I am for peace; my people

E431
.T15

are not for war, they are for peace; my section is not for war, we are all for peace. We are for the Constitution as it is; we are for the Union as it exists. We believe the Constitution as it is, secures the rights of all; and the Union, if preserved, can maintain the rights of all. We are, therefore, for both—for peace, and against war. I have not, therefore, risen to criminate or to denounce, or for any purpose of that sort. With gentlemen and their secret motives I have nothing to do. It is of parties—the good or evil tendency of their principles—their doctrines and their systems of policy, that I desire, freely, yet respectfully, to speak, on the present occasion. Honest men, Mr. Chairman, sometimes entertain very erroneous opinions—good men sometimes preach very absurd and dangerous doctrines. Paul, the great Apostle of the Gentiles, I presume, persecuted the early Christians with quite as much zeal and purity of purpose, at the time, as he ever afterwards preached the Gospel of life and salvation to a lost and ruined world. Yet, with all his zeal—with all his purity of purpose, he trampled under foot the precious blood of atonement, and crucified afresh the Lord of glory, by denying his Messiahship and his mission. While, therefore, I intend to speak freely, and what I think, of the opinions, views, and doctrines of all the political parties, I do not intend to attribute improper motives to any. I rise for no such purpose. I rise, sir, for a very different, a more important, and, I trust, for a much more laudable purpose. The rights of my constituents and the institutions of my State have been assailed; the equal rights of my section denied; our glorious Union is menaced; and I rise to discharge what I conceive to be a high duty I owe, in my representative capacity, to my constituents, to the Constitution of my country, to the Union of the States, to the freedom of religion, and to the equality of rights. I rise, sir, in the name and in behalf of all these great interests, to enter here, in my representative capacity, my humble, yet earnest and most solemn protest against, what I conceive to be, the erroneous, revolutionary, and suicidal principles and doctrines of Know Nothingism and Black Republicanism. I protest against the principles and policy of Black Republicanism, on the one hand, as violative of the Constitution, incendiary and revolutionary in their very nature, exciting strife and ill-will between the different sections of the Union by their very propagation, and, if carried out, not only *destructive* to the *rights* and *degrading* to the *people* of the South, but must and will, in the very nature of things, result in a disruption of the Union. I protest against the doctrines of Know Nothingism on the other hand, as virtually, though indirectly, uniting Church and State, getting up a war of races and religions, drawing invidious distinctions between both, incendiary and revolutionary in their very nature, exciting, by their propagation, discords and dissensions prejudicial to both Church and State—requiring new tests of birth and blood for office, unknown to, and violative of the Constitution, which, if carried out, while they may be slower in their operations, must and will prove no less ruinous in their results.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is not the only purpose for which I have risen. I have not risen merely to enter my protest against Know Nothingism and Black Republicanism—not merely to say that our rights have been assailed and our Union threatened. It will not do to raise the cry of danger, and do nothing to avert it. It will not do to see the whirlwind and the storm approaching from the North, and make no preparation to receive it. It will not do to say our glorious Union is menaced, and do nothing to save it. No, sir, this is not the part I wish or intend to play in the great political drama now being enacted before the country. I not only desire to be a faithful sentinel, but one also of the rank and file, in the great army of defense. And I rise, now, Mr. Chairman, to enlist in that army. I rise to enlist for the war. I have buckled on my armor, and never intend to take it off until the last foeman leaves the field, or I fall. I rise to take my stand with the Democracy of the country, against Know Nothingism, Black Republicanism, and all the isms—to defend the Constitution and the Union, against all aggression, innovation, or infraction, come from what quarter it may—in favor of freedom of thought, and freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of suffrage, freedom of religion, and the equality of rights—the time-honored principles of the old Whig and the old Democratic parties, which have brought us thus far so safely, so triumphantly, and so gloriously, through every vicissitude of fortune. It is here, as an independent Whig, I take my stand: it is here the old Whig party stood. It is here the old Democratic party now stands; and with them, and their time-honored principles, I intend to stand or fall. And if fall I must, my last cry, in falling, shall be for the Constitution and the Union—the freedom of religion, and the equality of rights.

To show you, Mr. Chairman, that I now stand precisely where the old Whig party, as a party, stood in 1844, when Mr. Clay himself was a candidate for the Presidency, running against Mr. Polk, I will read a preamble and string of resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of the Whigs of Louisville, Kentucky, on the 27th day of July, 1844, repudiating a Whig paper (the Louisville Tribune) which had been started there, and which they had previously indorsed. But, upon the appearance of an article in that paper, charging upon the Catholic church the identical charges now preferred by the Know Nothing party, the Whigs of Louisville met in mass, and passed the following preamble and resolutions, repudiating both the article and the paper. They read as follows:

"At a mass meeting of the Whigs of Louisville, convened at the Whig Pavilion, on the evening of the 27th instant, for the purpose of taking into consideration the propriety of making public expression of their opinions in relation to the course of the Louisville Tribune, recently established in this city, professing to be a Whig newspaper, on motion of Nathaniel Wolfe, president of the Louisville Clay Club, William J. Graves was called to the chair. Thereupon Mr. Wolfe, after some explanatory remarks, offered the following preamble and resolutions, which were unanimously adopted:

"Whereas, a new paper called the Louisville Tribune, recently established in this city, professing to be a Whig paper, has published editorials and communications, one of which was signed 'A Native American,' of a most anti-republican character, *reflecting upon the Catholic persuasion*, and especially the Catholic priesthood, charging them with hostility to American liberty: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That the Whigs, as a party, *utterly repudiate and denounce* the anti-republican and unjust strictures

indulged by the Louisville Tribune towards the Catholic Church of this country.

"*Resolved*, That the Whigs of this city regard the continued *separation of Church and State* as essential to the perpetuity of our free institutions; and we hereby denounce the efforts of the Locofoco party to array against each other the different religious persuasions, and to create a line of *political demarkation between the Protestants and the Catholics*, as subversive of the best interests of religion, and inimical to the perpetuity of civil and religious liberty.

"*Resolved*, That the Louisville Tribune, in the opinion of this meeting, is not a correct exponent of Whig principles, and we hereby rescind a resolution adopted by us upon the establishment of that paper, that we should subscribe for and recommend it to the support of the Whig party.

"WM. J. GRAVES, *Chairman*."

These resolutions repudiate and denounce the Catholic feature in the Know Nothing platform as unjust and anti-republican. They were offered by Whigs, in a Whig meeting, in Mr. Clay's own State, under his own eye, by his own friends, and in the name and in behalf of the Whig party, as such, and when Mr. Clay himself was a candidate for the Presidency. They say in the resolutions, that they repudiate, *as a party*, the unjust and anti-republican article, and the paper as a Whig paper. They repudiate the article containing the charges against the Catholics as unjust, anti-republican, and anti-Whig. So, then, Whiggery in 1844, and Know Nothingism in 1856, are antipodal.

To show you now that this was not done against Mr. Clay's wishes and views, I will read from his own speeches, made in Congress, upon the same subject. In Mr. Clay's speech on the emancipation of South America, in speaking of the Catholic religion, he says:

"They worship the same God that we do. Their prayers are offered up, in their temples, to the same Redeemer whose intercession we expect to save us. Nor is there anything in the Catholic religion unfriendly to freedom."

From Mr. Clay's speech on American industry, in 1825, in alluding to the Catholic religion, he says:

"I think the gentleman from Virginia does great injustice to the Catholic religion in specifying that as one of the leading causes of the decline of Spain. It is a religion entitled to great respect; and there is nothing in its character incompatible with the highest degree of national prosperity. Is not Catholic France the most polished, and in many other respects, the most distinguished, state of Christendom? Is not Flanders, the most populous part of Europe, also Catholic? Are the Catholic parts of Switzerland and Germany less prosperous than those which are Protestant."

You then see that Mr. Clay, the great leader of the Whig party, and the Whig party, (in Kentucky at least,) as such, have always occupied precisely the same ground I now occupy upon that subject. And I appeal to every old-line Whig in the nation, to rally to the rescue of the time-honored principles, so ably and eloquently maintained by their once gallant, but now departed leader. I am proud to say, sir, that the unrivalled sage of Ashland has one son (James B. Clay) who is now nobly defending and maintaining the sentiments of his illustrious father, which I have just read.

I have now defined my position, and indicated my future course. I will next contrast, briefly, the relative positions of the three parties now before the country, with their candidates seeking to obtain the control of the Government. In doing this, Mr. Chairman, I will endeavor to display that coolness, candor, and correctness, demanded by the crisis, and to view the relations, on all sides, in the light of truth, justice, and fair-play. I will, at least, not be guilty, knowingly, of judging others by a rule by which I would not willingly be judged myself. I will hold no party responsible for any action, either past or prospective, not warranted by the record, or clearly indicated by their positions and doctrines.

There are three parties now in the field contending for the mastery and seeking to obtain the control of the Government. What the issues—what their relative positions—slavery or no slavery—is the great, the paramount issue. Their relative positions are—Democracy in power, and Know Nothingism and Black Republicanism seeking to put him out; or, substituting the candidates for their respective parties, Buchanan in power, and Fillmore and Frémont endeavoring to remove him. And how do they propose to do it? Why, by a sort of triangular fight—by Black Republicanism in the North, and by Know Nothingism in the South. And why put him out? Because, says Frémont in the North, he is for slavery and the slaveocracy. Because, says Mr. Fillmore in the South, he prefers the Constitution of Washington to the constitution of "Sam;" because he is for freedom of religion and equality of rights; because he will not "swear" to vote for no man for any office in the Government, State or National, unless he be a native-born American citizen, in favor of Americans ruling America, nor if he be a Roman Catholic. These are the parties, these their positions, these their objects, and these their plans of operation. Democracy in power—shall we put him out? is the great question. We are called upon to disband, denounce, and discard the old Whig and the old Democratic parties, as odious, treacherous, and untrustworthy; to renounce, and forever repudiate, as old fogyism, their time-honored principles and policy, which have now withstood every storm for near three quarters of a century; to adopt the unjust, unwise, and revolutionary doctrines of Know Nothingism and Black Republicanism, which already, ere they are two years old, have shaken society to its foundations, and the Government to its center. Talk about *obnoxious acts* and *violated pledges!* Who ever heard of ballot-boxes destroyed, houses burned, the inmates killed, and voters murdered in going to and coming from the polls, in any great political contest in this country, between the old Whig and the old Democratic parties? Sir, I make no charge. I only speak of the record to vindicate the truth of history. If I could, I would throw a thick vail over that dark page of our country's history, and hide it forever from the view. "I have no doubt the spirit that bore the mournful deeds to Heaven's high chancery blushed as he gave them in; but I fear the recording angel, as he wrote them down, found no tear to drop, to blot them out forever." They may yet be called to pass in review before the bar of retributive justice.

But, Mr. Chairman, to return, "for I have no joys 'mid scenes like these." Democracy is in power, and we are asked to turn him out for the reasons assigned. Shall we do it? is the great question for the South, for the national men of every section, to determine in the approaching presidential election. Now, sir, to present this whole subject in its true light, as it really is: as Mr. Frémont is the candidate of a section only,

nominated and run by a section—is purely upon a sectional question, and for sectional purposes, as they themselves avow, to break down slavery and the slave power;—as this is Mr. Frémont's position, I desire, for the moment, to drop him, and contrast the relative positions of Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Fillmore, both of whom claim to be national men.

Then, sir, I ask the South, the North, the conservative men everywhere, the old-line Whigs, and Democrats, are you for the Kansas-Nebraska bill, which neither establishes nor prohibits slavery in either Kansas or Nebraska, but which leaves the actual settlers of both perfectly free, when they come to frame their organic law, and ask for admission into the Union as a State, to regulate their own institutions for themselves, to have slavery or not, as they choose? If you are, Mr. Buchanan is with you, out and out; while Mr. Fillmore, in his platform, places the passage of that very act, as one of the charges preferred against the present Administration; and in his late Newburg speech, made only a few weeks since, he characterizes the repeal of the Missouri compromise line as the result of "selfish ambition," a "wanton disturbance," a "Pandora's box, out of which have issued all the evils which now afflict the country."

Are you for the fugitive slave law and its faithful execution, which, in conformity with the Constitution, requires the rendition of slaves, escaping into the free States, to their proper and legitimate owners? If you are, Mr. Buchanan is with you square out, without equivocation or evasion.

Are you opposed to the Wilmot proviso? If so, Mr. Buchanan, by his votes, by his speeches, and in his platform, is straight out with you again.

Are you for applying to all the unorganized Territories we now have, or may hereafter acquire, the principle of non-intervention, as set forth in the compromise measures of 1850, and the Kansas-Nebraska bill of 1854? If you are, Mr. Buchanan has planted himself upon that great principle of the right and capability of man for self-government; while Mr. Fillmore, in his celebrated Erie letter, which I will now read, said that he was opposed to the annexation of Texas, *under any circumstances*, as long as *slaves were held there*, and in favor of the *immediate abolition of slavery* in the District of Columbia, and the abolition of the inter-State slave trade. Mr. Fillmore's Erie letter reads as follows:

BUFFALO, *October* 17, 1838.

SIR: Your communication of the 15th instant, as chairman of the committee appointed by the anti-slavery society of the county of Erie, has just come to hand. You solicit my answer to the following interrogatories:

1. Do you believe that petitioning Congress on the subject of slavery and the slave trade ought to be received, read, and respectfully considered by the representatives of the people?

2. Are you opposed to the annexation of Texas to this Union, under any circumstances, so long as slaves are held there?

3. Are you in favor of Congress exercising all the constitutional powers it possesses to abolish the internal slave trade between the States?

4. Are you in favor of immediate legislation for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia?

I am much engaged, and have no time to enter into argument, or explain at length my reasons for my opinions. I shall, therefore, content myself for the present by answering *all* your interrogatories in the *affirmative*, and leave for some future occasion a more extended discussion on the subject.

MILLARD FILLMORE.

Now, my honorable colleague [Mr. Cox] said in his speech, the other day, that every party should be considered the *only true exponent of its own views*. Judging Mr. Fillmore by that rule, who can read this letter, and have any doubt about his position? He says positively in this letter, he is for abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia, and the inter-State slave trade, and opposed to the annexation of Texas, unless they abolish slavery there.

I desire now to compare Mr. Fillmore's positions on slavery, as indicated in his Erie letter, which I have just read, with Mr. Buchanan's record for twenty years, from 1836 to 1856; and then let you, sir, and the committee, and the country, see which has the highest claims to nationality. This is Mr. Buchanan's record for twenty years:

1. In 1836, Mr. Buchanan supported a bill to prohibit the circulation of abolition papers through the mails.

2. In the same year he proposed and voted for the admission of Arkansas.

3. In 1836-37 he denounced and voted to reject petitions for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia.

4. In 1837 he voted for Mr. Calhoun's famous resolutions defining the rights of the States and the limits of Federal authority, and affirming it to be the duty of the Government to protect and uphold the institutions of the South.

5. In 1838, 1839, and 1840, he invariably voted with southern Senators against the consideration of anti-slavery petitions.

6. In 1844 and 1845 he advocated and voted for the annexation of Texas.

7. In 1847 he sustained the Clayton compromise.

8. In 1850 he proposed and urged the extension of the Missouri compromise to the Pacific ocean.

9. But he promptly acquiesced in the compromise of 1850, and employed all his influence in favor of the faithful execution of the fugitive slave law.

10. In 1851 he remonstrated against an enactment of the Pennsylvania Legislature for obstructing the arrest and return of fugitive slaves.

11. In 1854 he negotiated for the acquisition of Cuba.

12. In 1856 he approves the repeal of the Missouri restriction, and supports the principles of the Kansas-Nebraska act.

13. He never gave a vote against the interests of slavery, and never uttered a word which could pain the most sensitive southern heart.

Now, sir, I have read you Mr. Fillmore's Erie letter, containing his *own* account of his *own position;* and I have read the written record of Mr. Buchanan's votes, giving his position. Mr. Fillmore's Erie letter says he is in favor of abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia. Mr. Buchanan's record says he is against it. Mr. Fillmore's Erie letter says he was against the annexation of Texas, unless slavery should be abolished there. Mr. Buchanan's record says he voted to receive Texas as it was. Mr. Fillmore's

Erie letter says he is for abolishing the inter-State slave trade. Mr. Buchanan's recorded vote for Mr. Calhoun's famous resolutions of 1837 says he is against it. Now, here is the record of the one, and the letter of the other, defining their positions. Which is the best?—which shall we believe? Mr. Buchanan's record makes him sound and national: Mr. Fillmore's letter make him unsound and sectional. What shall we do then? Shall we sustain the record and the letter, and let Mr. Buchanan and his party continue at the helm, and Mr. Fillmore and his friends remain where they are? or shall we falsify both record and letter, and say Mr. Fillmore is national, and Mr. Buchanan sectional? Sir, is it possible? has it come to this? Is the cause of Know Nothingism so desperate that, in order to save it from swift and inevitable destruction, we must say that Mr. Buchanan's record for twenty years is false; and that the great *intensely American candidate* for the Presidency did not, when he wrote his Erie letter, know what he was for?

But, again, in 1838, the following resolution was introduced into the Senate:

"That any attempt of Congress to abolish slavery in any Territory of the United States in which it exists would create serious alarm and just apprehensions in the States sustaining that domestic institution; would be a violation of good faith towards the inhabitants of any such Territory, who were permitted to settle with and hold slaves therein, because the people of any such Territory have not asked for the abolition of slavery therein, and because, *when any such Territory shall be admitted into the Union as a State, the people thereof will be entitled to decide that question exclusively for themselves.*"

For this resolution stood side by side James Buchanan, Henry Clay, and John C. Calhoun. Mr. Wesbter against it.

But I wish now to read the following resolutions offered by Mr. Calhoun in the Senate of the United States, in the session of 1837-38, and voted for by Mr. Buchanan, as mentioned in the statement which I have just read. They are as follows:

"*Resolved*, That in the adoption of the Federal Constitution, the States adopting the same, acted, severally, as free, independent, and sovereign States; and that each for itself, by its own voluntary assent, entered the Union with a view to its increased security against all dangers, domestic as well as foreign, and the more perfect and secure enjoyment of its advantages, natural, political, and social.

"*Resolved* That in delegating a portion of their powers to be exercised by the Federal Government, the States retained, severally, the exclusive and sole right over their domestic institutions and police, to the full extent to which those powers were not thus delegated, and are alone responsible for them; and that any intermeddling of any one or more States, or a combination of their citizens, with the domestic institutions and police of the others, on any ground, political, *moral, or religious, or under any pretext whatever*, with the view to their alteration or subversion, is not warranted by the Constitution, tending to endanger the domestic peace and tranquillity of the States interfered with, subversive of the objects for which the Constitution was formed, and, by necessary consequence, tending to weaken and destroy the Union itself.

"*Resolved*, That this Government was instituted and adopted by the several States of this Union as a common agent, in order to carry into effect the powers which they had delegated by the Constitution for their mutual security and prosperity; and that in fulfillment of this high and sacred trust, this Government is bound so to exercise its powers as not to interfere with the stability and security of the domestic institutions of the States that compose the Union; and that it is the solemn duty of the Government to resist, to the extent of their constitutional power, all attempts by one portion of the Union to use it as an instrument to attack the domestic institutions of the other, or to weaken or destroy such institutions.

"*Resolved*, That domestic slavery, as it exists in the southern and western States of this Union, composes an important part of their domestic institutions, inherited from their ancestors, and existing at the adoption of the Constitution, by which it is recognized as constituting an important element in the apportionment of powers among the States, and that no change of opinion or feeling on the part of the other States of the Union in relation to it, can justify them or their citizens in open and systematic attacks thereon, with the view to its overthrow; and that all such attacks are in manifest violation of the mutual and solemn pledge to protect and defend each other, given by the States, respectively, on entering into the constitutional compact which formed the Union, and as such are a manifest breach of faith, and a violation of the most solemn obligations.

"*Resolved*, That the interference by the citizens of any of the States, with the view to the abolition of slavery in this District, is endangering the rights and security of the people of the District: and that any act or measure of Congress designed to abolish slavery in this District would be a violation of the faith implied in the cessions by the States of Virginia and Maryland, a just cause of alarm to the people of the slaveholding States, and a direct and inevitable tendency to disturb and endanger the Union.

"*Resolved*, That any attempt of Congress to abolish slavery in any Territory of the United States in which it exists, would create serious alarm and just apprehension, in the States sustaining that domestic institution; would be a violation of good faith towards the inhabitants of any such Territory who have been permitted to enter with, and hold slaves therein, because the people of any such Territory have not asked for the abolition of slavery therein, and because, when any such Territory shall be admitted into the Union as a State, the people thereof will be entitled to decide that question exclusively for themselves."

These resolutions show Mr. Buchanan, not only sound upon the question of slavery, but sound on the Constitution.

But again, in 1842, when the Whigs were advocating and urging a modification of the veto power of the President, Mr. Buchanan, in the Senate of the United States opposing it, and sustaining the Constitution as it is, said:

"It would be easy to imagine interests of the deepest importance to particular sections which might be seriously endangered by its destruction. In the southern States, which compose the weaker portion of the Union, a species of property exists which is attracting the attention of the civilized world. These States never would have become parties to the Union had not their rights in this property been secured by the Federal Constitution." * * * "It is possible that at some future day the majority in Congress may attempt by indirect means to emancipate the slaves of the South. There is no knowing through what channel the ever active spirit of fanaticism may seek to accomplish its purpose. Do we feel so secure, in this hour of peril at home, as to be willing to prostrate any of the barriers which the Constitution has reared against hasty and dangerous legislation? No, sir, never was the value of the veto power more manifest than at the present moment. For the weaker portion of the Union, whose constitutional rights are now assailed with such violence, to think of abandoing this safeguard, would be almost suicidal."

What southern, what national man anywhere, can read this speech of the great Pennsylvanian in the Senate of the United States, in defense of the noble charter of our liberties, as it is—as it was framed, and fashioned, and signed, and secured to us by the Father of his Country, and his illustrious compeers? What patriot in the land can read this speech without seeing and exclaiming: "With Buchanan at the helm, the Constitution will be maintained, the Union preserved, and our free institutions perpetuated!" But, again, this is Mr. Buchanan's record.

I wish now to compare Mr Fillmore's record in Congress with that speech of Mr. Buchanan, and see which is the national and conservative man. The following is Mr. Fillmore's record. The Journals of Congress show that Mr. Fillmore supported, by his *vote*, petitions:

1. To declare slaves *free* who had gone to sea

with the consent of their masters, and to protect them in their freedom;

2. To repeal all laws and constitutional provisions by which the Federal Government is bound to protect the institution of slavery;

3. Against the admission of any new State into the Union whose constitution at all tolerates slavery;

4. Against the annexation of Texas, solely on the ground that slavery existed there;

5. To abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, though the whole people of the District cherished the institution, and never petitioned for its abolition;

6. To prohibit the buying and selling of slaves in the District and other Territories of the Union;

7. He supported by his vote petitions of Congress to repeal the act of the Territory of Florida, to prevent migration of free negroes to the Territory;

8. He voted in favor of petitions to *naturalize and make American citizens of* NEGROES *from every quarter of the earth!* and

9. He voted in favor of a petition to receive *negro* embassadors from the black Republic of Hayti.

I will leave you, Mr. Chairman, and the country, with these two records, to say which is the national and which the sectional, which is the safe, and which is the unsafe man to be trusted, Mr. Buchanan or Mr. Fillmore.

But let us see further, if we can, how Mr. Fillmore stands. I think the record will show that he, like his party, is, if you will allow the expression, in a state of all-to-piece-ativeness. The Whig party, in convention assembled in Baltimore in 1852, declared that—

"The series of acts of the Thirty First Congress, commonly known as the compromise, or adjustment, (the act for the recovery of fugitives from labor included,) are received and acquiesced in by the Whigs of the United States as a final settlement, in *principle and substance*, of the subjects to which they relate."

This resolution committed the Whigs, as a party, to the non-intervention principle of the Kansas-Nebraska bill; and, "in spirit and substance" to the repeal of the Missouri line. And consequently, in 1854, nearly every Whig, Senator and Representative, in Congress, from the South, voted for the Kansas-Nebraska bill with that understanding.

What next? I will read now an extract from an editorial article in the Louisville Journal, dated November 16, 1854, after the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill repealing the Missouri compromise line, showing that not only the Whig party, but the Whig press, indorsed the *principle* of that bill. The extract is as follows:

"MISSOURI COMPROMISE—MODE OF ADJUSTMENT.—Thirty four years ago the Congress of the United States passed an act which has ever since been known by the name of the 'Missouri compromise act.' Congress then attempted to establish by legislation what can only permanently and definitely be done by an amendment of the Constitution. This miscalled compromise was practically inoperative, because it was *unconstitutional*, and it was unsatisfactory, because it was *unjust*. It was *unconstitutional*, because the power to legislate in reference to slavery as property—except in the case of fugitives—is not conferred on Congress by the Constitution, neither is such a power necessary to the exercise of any other one given to Congress. It was *unjust*, because, while it made all the territory north of 36° 30' absolutely free, it did not do so as to that south of this line, but left it to the will of the people who were its inhabitants."

This, sir, is what the Journal then said upon that subject. What he now says we will have to read his paper to see. If the Journal was then right, we certainly had truth, justice, and the Constitution upon our side, in the passage and maintenance of the Kansas-Nebraska bill; and if truth, justice, and the Constitution be on our side, the people will certainly go with us; they are always right—always on the side of *truth, justice*, and the *Constitution;* and if the PEOPLE be for us, WHO in this country can stand against us? But, again, to show the rights the Journal then thought the South had in the Territories of the United States, under the Constitution, I will read another extract from that paper of December 5, 1854, in confirmation of the one I have just read. This article is so consonant with my own views upon the subject, and so much better expressed than I could express them myself, that I will transfer them as they are to my speech, and adopt and indorse them as my own. It is in answer to an article of the Albany Evening Journal, and reads as follows:

"If the United States have the right or power conferred on them to acquire territory at all, it must be for the use and benefit of all the States; there is nothing in the Constitution which even by implication will warrant a partial appropriation of this common property of the Union.

"The right of property in newly acquired territory is either perfect or imperfect. If it is perfect, then it carries with it all the collateral rights, such as the enjoyment of property of any description that the people of either the North or South may happen to own. If it is imperfect, then must the imperfection be occasioned by some constitutional or legal provision. It cannot exist of itself.

"The Constitution has not only not prohibited property in slaves, but it has recognized it by providing for their reclamation when they shall have escaped. The editor of the Albany Journal says that we do ourselves injustice by putting free and slave labor on a common platform. We will endeavor to take care of our own reputation, and in doing so shall inform that editor that we have not contrasted the two kinds of labor. It is too late for the South to *argue* the relative merits of the two species of labor. With her that question is settled—slave labor is a fixed fact, fastened on her beyond control. It is their mutual *rights* and not the relative *advantages or* disadvantages that are now the proper subjects of discussion. Suppose we grant an indefinite superiority of free over slave labor, does the existence of such a fact take from the South the right to use her inferior labor, such as it is, at all? Such a conclusion is as illogical as its practical enforcement would be outrageous and unjust.

"But it is asserted by some of the more radical of the Free Soilers that slavery does not nor cannot exist in the United States territory unless *sanctioned by express legislation*. To such persons we reply that the legislative authority is found in the *national Constitution*—the organic law of the land. If those who contend that slavery can only exist by direct authority establishing it, mean to limit their application of the principle to a new government never before formed, then they are correct, because the relation of master and slave cannot exist *per se*—it must be established by the laws of the country. Such is the case in this country. It was established in the States prior to the formation of the national Constitution; its existence was recognized by that instrument, and the relative rights and duties of the several States were established with reference to its peculiar requirements. The relation of master and slave having been thus legally established, the right follows the master wherever it has not been legally divested. Another State can divest him of this right, because the State's authority to exclude slavery within their limits is unquestioned and unquestionable; but in an organized Territory, belonging to the nation, there is no authority competent to legislate on the subject. The citizen of the slave State, in the exercise of his right of *common use* in the Territory, has the collateral right to take with him his property.

"The North may assert the right and the design of appro-

priating all the territory now and hereafter to be acquired to the use and benefit of free labor, or free people alone; but if she does so, it is nothing but the assertion of the right of revolution, and of a determination to resort to the arbitrament of might rather than right, in the enforcement of her claims."

Now, Mr. Chairman, how any man could believe all this, and then think it wrong to pass, abide by, and maintain the Kansas-Nebraska bill, I am at a loss to see. I will not stop now to comment at length upon the subject, but leave you and the country to determine for yourselves. I will add, however, that, if the Missouri compromise was both "unjust" and "unconstitutional," depriving the South of her legal and constitutional rights, as the Journal here says it did, how, in the name of reason, justice, and the Constitution, could it be either unwise or improper to repeal it? It certainly cannot be wrong to do *justice* to *all*, and *maintain* the *Constitution*.

What next? In June, 1855, the great Know Nothing party met in Philadelphia and passed the following resolution, known as the twelfth section, which is as follows:

"XII. The American party, having arisen upon the ruins and in spite of the opposition of the Whig and Democratic parties, cannot be held in any manner responsible for the obnoxious acts or violated pledges of either. And the systematic agitation of the slavery question by those parties having elevated sectional hostility into a positive element of political power, and brought our institutions into peril; it has, therefore, become the imperative duty of the American party to interpose for the purpose of giving peace to the country, and perpetuity to the Union. And, as experience has shown it impossible to reconcile opinions so extreme as those which separate the disputants; and as there can be no dishonor in submitting to the laws, the National Council has deemed it the best guarantee of common justice and of future peace, *to abide by and maintain the existing laws upon the subject of slavery, as a final and conclusive settlement of that subject, in spirit and in substance.* And regarding it the highest duty to avow their opinions upon a subject so important, in distinct and unequivocal terms, it is hereby declared, as the sense of this National Council, that Congress possesses no power under the Constitution, to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the States where it does or may exist, or to exclude any State from admission into the Union because its constitution does or does not recognize the institution of slavery as a part of its social system; and expressly pretermitting any expression of opinion upon the power of Congress to establish or prohibit slavery in any Territory,—it is the sense of the National Council, that Congress ought not to legislate upon the subject of slavery within the territory of the United States, and that any interference by Congress with slavery as it exists in the District of Columbia, would be a violation of the spirit and intention of the compact by which the State of Maryland ceded the District to the United States, and a breach of the national faith."

Now, the Kansas-Nebraska bill, repealing the Missouri compromise line, had become a law, before this famous twelfth section was adopted. Then, sir, this section solemnly pledged Mr. Fillmore and every Know Nothing in the Union, the Louisville Journal included, "to abide by and maintain the existing laws (the Kansas-Nebraska bill) upon the subject of slavery, as a *final* and *conclusive settlement* of the subject, in *spirit* and in *substance*." How can Mr. Fillmore now, without violating his pledge thus given, characterize that act as a "reckless and unwise policy"—the "result of a selfish ambition"—a "wanton disturbance"—a "Pandora's box?" Why, sir, if the Kansas-Nebraska act be all that Mr. Fillmore now says it is, why did he and his party, the Louisville Journal included, pledge themselves, at Philadelphia, in June, 1855, to "abide by and maintain it?" Why did they do it? I will leave them and the country to say.

Well, sir, if Mr. Fillmore and his party can meet in June, 1855, and pledge themselves to the country "to abide by and maintain all the existing laws on slavery," and then meet in February, 1856, and repudiate and denounce the existing laws on slavery, how can they ask the country, and expect the country, to believe they are in favor of the existing laws on slavery? Now, Mr. Chairman, read this twelfth section, pledging Mr. Fillmore and his whole party, to "abide by and maintain" the Kansas-Nebraska bill, "in spirit and in substance." Then read the thirteenth section in their present new platform, denouncing that bill, for repealing the Missouri compromise line, and say what right they have to talk about "obnoxious acts or violated pledges." Read these, and then say, who has kept the faith. Then say if Mr. Fillmore and his party have not forfeited all claim to nationality, conservatism, and consistency. Read the articles in the Louisville Journal, and then say if Mr. Fillmore is willing to restore the "*injustice*" and outrage perpetrated upon the South, by the passage of the Missouri compromise line. Read them, and say if the Kansas-Nebraska bill shall not stand. Read these, and then say if Mr. Buchanan is not the only candidate now upon the track for the Presidency, who has been firm, conservative, and consistent, throughout. Read these, and say if Mr. Fillmore has stood by the resolutions of his party, passed at Baltimore in 1852, "*in spirit and in substance*," then say if he has stood, and still stands by the famous twelfth section, pledging him to maintain the existing laws upon slavery. Read them all, and then tell me where the obnoxious acts and violated pledges are, where the true, conservative, constitutional grounds are—whether with the old Whig and Democratic parties, or with the new *intensely American party?*

Now, see the very striking contrast, in the consistency of the old-line Whigs and the Democratic party, and the Know Nothing party. In 1850, the Democrats and Whigs voted for the compromise measures as a principle. In 1852 they indorsed them as right. In 1854 they carried them out, in spirit and in substance, by the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill. In 1855 they maintained and defended them. In 1856 they have started a candidate for the Presidency, who is for them, out and out—in all their length and breadth, heighth and depth—in spirit and in substance. I will, now, sir, leave you and the country to determine who is right, and who wrong; who worthy, and who unworthy; who has kept the faith, and who has broken the faith; who shall be the next President—Frémont, Fillmore, or Buchanan.

I desire now to give you what one of Mr. Buchanan's ablest and most distinguished opponents, the Hon. George Robertson, of Kentucky, said of him and his position, in a public speech, a few days since, in my own State. The following statement in relation to his speech I clip from a Kentucky paper:

"A Candid Admission.—The Hon. George Robertson, in a public speech at Keene, Jessamine county, on Saturday last, declared that Mr. Buchanan was an *able and experienced statesman, an honorable gentleman, a patriot, firm, reliable, and sound on the slavery question, and that the*

country would be safe in his hands. He said he did not intend to attack him on any of these points. He was a good man, and a safe man, and no man could deny it."

This, sir, is what Mr. Buchanan's enemies have said of him, his position and principles.

And I will now give you what one of Mr. Fillmore's at present warm personal, and formerly political, friends says of him, his platform, and his party. It is from one who knows what he is talking about, and understands what he says. The following is an extract from the letter of Mr. Burwell to his constituents, resigning his seat in the House of Delegates in Virginia, to which he had been elected by the Know Nothing party. Mr. Burwell was the former editor of the American Organ, in this city, and also of the Republic, Mr. Fillmore's organ while President. The extract is as follows:

"Regarding the question of slavery as paramount to all others before the American people, satisfied that the Whig party of the North had fused with the Free-Soilers, and that the Democratic party was paralyzed by its own dissensions, I had, with many others, sought in the American party a love of Union, a fraternal affection, and a national pride, which should reconcile and quiet forever the differences existing among us.

"The first national action of this party encouraged the hope that it would realize this patriotic expectation. It announced in June, 1855, that it would maintain the existing legislation upon the subject of slavery as a settlement of the question. Under this declaration some thirty-three members of Congress were elected by the American party in the southern States.

"In February, 1856, this policy was changed. The pledge to maintain existing legislation was substituted by a creed, in which not only the subject, but the name of 'slavery' is carefully ignored. The guarantee for the admission of new slave States, specifically given by the declaration of 1855, is replaced by an article which recognizes the right of the legal citizens of a Territory 'to frame their constitution and laws, and to regulate their own domestic and social affairs in their own mode, subject only to'—the Wilmot proviso, or to 'the provisions of the Federal constitution,' which last phrase, under the interpretation of the dominant majority in Congress, means precisely the same thing. With this restriction the privilege of admission into the Union is granted to the territorial State whenever it shall 'have the requisite population for one Representative in Congress.'

"At the same time, and upon the same principle of neutrality, the American party nominated for its candidate a gentleman of integrity and patriotism, but it did not require him to say whether he would, if elected, veto a bill restoring the Missouri restriction, or repealing the Kansas act. Those who have regarded the pending question too important to be left in doubt, have been informed that the nominee is 'platform enough,' and that his past official acts afford a sufficient assurance of his future. Taking his signature of the compromise of 1850 as the most prominent of these acts, we encounter insurmountable difficulties of construction. The friends of the Kansas act contend that it is a legitimate deduction from the compromise of 1850; but thousands who advocated that compromise assert that the Kansas act is a flagrant violation of that measure. If the inference, that the Kansas act resulted from the compromise, is inevitable, there could be no controversy upon this subject. But there is a radical difference upon this subject; therefore the position of the American nominee upon this question is doubtful; and those who are disposed to support him may, without impugning his integrity, ask his construction upon the consistency of the Kansas act with the compromise of 1850, and whether it is his purpose to maintain or repeal it. Until some such declaration shall be made, the Americans of the South are wholly without assurance against the continued agitation of a dangerous question, or of having rights, deemed by them invaluable, surrendered by the act of their own representatives.

"This issue upon which parties have organized for the ensuing campaign is: 'Shall any more slave States be admitted into the Union?'

"Foremost and most formidable in this contest stands the Black Republican party, a dangerous compound of fanaticism and political cupidity. It is numerous, and of powerful resources; it is led by ambitious and sagacious men. It intends to employ the numbers of the North to subjugate the South and govern the country. Its material of warfare consists in impeaching the title of your property, defaming your character, and combining the most despotic and lawless influences in a crusade against you. Its plan of warfare is to cut off the supplies and communications of slavery, to invest its citadel and to send in a flag inscribed: 'Assault or unconditional surrender.'

"The Democratic party has been, by force of circumstances, placed in direct antagonism to this party. It stands not only pledged, but committed beyond the power of recantation or withdrawal, to maintain your rights as political equals in this Confederacy.

"With my opinions, neutrality would be at this important crisis little better than treason. I shall, therefore, vote for the Democratic candidates at the ensuing presidential election; because that is the only party committed to assert the rights of the South, and because the opinions avowed by that party upon the subject of slavery represent my own."

This is the letter of a distinguished gentleman, who knows all about Mr. Fillmore and his platform, and he says neither will do for the present crisis.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will add but a word more on this part of the subject. I have shown, by Mr. Buchanan's speeches, by his votes, by his history, by his platform, by what his friends and by what his enemies say about him, that he stands straight out, square up, without equivocation, evasion, or pretermission, on the slavery question, which is the issue, the great paramount issue, now before the country, and which has to be settled, for weal or woe, and it may be, for life or death, in the coming presidential contest. I have shown Mr. Buchanan to be sound, conservative, national. What is Mr. Fillmore's position? He stands on a platform as silent as the grave, on the great, the paramount issue now before the country, shaking it from its center to its circumference; not one word, nor one letter in it about slavery, or the adjustment of the slavery question; not able or willing, now, to say himself, or to suffer any friend to say for him, whether, if elected, he would or would not approve the Wilmot proviso, if it should be applied by Congress to the Territories. Not able or willing now to say, nor any of his friends for him, whether, if Congress should restore the Missouri compromise line, he would or would not veto it. Not able or willing now to say, nor any of his friends for him, whether, if Congress were to repeal *all* the existing laws on slavery, the fugitive slave law included, he would or would not veto that bill. Why, sir, in order to be considered orthodox with all parties, and on both sides, he has recently concluded to take no side upon any subject connected with slavery. In order to conquer both the other parties, he has agreed to fight neither. In order to get all sides, he has agreed to take no side. In order to aid and sustain the South, he has agreed not to fight the North. In order to aid the North, he has agreed not to fight the South. He has agreed, in his platform, to occupy no position, for the present, if you will only give him the high position of the White House next November. Yes, sir, although he has said, in his Erie letter, which I have read, that he was opposed to the annexation of Texas, unless slavery was abolished there, and in favor of passing laws for the immediate abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and for the abolition of the inter-State slave trade, &c.; although he and his whole party, in June, 1855, agreed and pledged themselves in the twelfth

section of the Philadelphia platform, "to abide by and maintain all the then existing laws on slavery as a final and conclusive settlement of that question;" yet, sir, when this great slavery issue is now thrust upon the country, and raging to its highest possible pitch; when the Black Republican party in the North, tauntingly and defiantly, say to the South, "Our armies are in the field; come on, Macduff; the lines are drawn; no more compromises are to be made, and no more slave States are to be admitted into the Union;" yet, sir, notwithstanding all this, notwithstanding the Union is shaken to its center, and the whole Government reels to and fro like a drunken man, yet Mr. Fillmore and his party, regardless of all former pledges, choose now to ignore, evade, and pretermit the whole question, from beginning to end, and yet ask us to believe them the soundest party in the Union, on the slavery question. Good souls, they are afraid to say anything for fear of making a *fuss!* Yes, sir, they are afraid of agitation—of making a fuss, as they term it. Why, sir, ask a Know Nothing in my district if he is for the Kansas-Nebraska act, and he will at once respond by saying, "The old Pope of Rome will take the country." Ask him if he is for the Wilmot proviso, or the fugitive slave law, or non-intervention, or anything connected with the slavery question, and his response is, "Why, the foreigners will take the country." Yes, sir, they make a great noise about foreigners and Catholics for office, when there is not a solitary man in the United States, of any party, and never has been, advocating either for office, to the exclusion of natives or Protestants. But when they come to the great question of slavery, they are as silent as the grave.

Mr. Chairman, why all this clap-trap about foreigners and Catholics? and all this ignoring, evasion, and pretermission about slavery and the *constitutional rights* of the *South?* If Mr. Fillmore is for the Kansas-Nebraska bill, why does he not say so? If his party are for it, why do they not speak out in their platform? If he is against the application of the Wilmot proviso to the Territories, why does he not take his stand? If he will veto a restoration of the Missouri compromise line, why does he not speak out? Why does he not take position upon one or the other side of all these great questions, and let every one know where he stands? Sir, we want no non-committal candidate for the Presidency now. We want no milk-and-cider, wishy-washy, shally-shanty, canny-canty, sort of man for the present crisis. We want a man who is not afraid of the light—one who will speak out—who will say what he is for, especially upon a subject of such paramount importance. Sir, a man who is *unwilling* to say what he thinks right in such a crisis, cannot administer the Government. He who is *afraid* to say what he thinks right, is unfit to administer the Government; but it does not suit the Know Nothing plan of operations to speak out. It is contrary to their tactics. They commenced in the dark—they must continue in the dark. They must ignore, evade, and pretermit, to save a *fuss*; and say nothing, and dodge around, to jump in between two fires. Their positions and doctrines are like their great leader, "Sam," who looked beautiful in the dark where you could not see him, but when brought to the day, and the light of truth suffered to fall upon him, was found to be, *all over*, full of wounds, bruises, and putrifying sores. Their doctrines, under the cover of secrecy, and the high-sounding phrase of "Americans shall rule America," all sounded and seemed very well; but when brought out to view, and we were told how these Americans were to rule America, the whole thing was found to be a system of absurdities, injustices, and impracticabilities, not one single principle of which can be carried out practically, by an act of Congress, without first changing the Constitution of the United States, which fact I now propose to show, having said all I desired to say as to the relative positions of Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Fillmore on the slavery question.

What, then, are the prominent, distinctive features of Know Nothingism? They are these:

1. No man, for any office, State or national, unless he be a native-born American citizen, in favor of Americans ruling America, nor if he be a Roman Catholic.

2. An extension of the naturalization laws to twenty-one years' residence, in order to citizenship; and an enforcement of the principle, that no State or Territory can admit others than native-born citizens to the right of suffrage or of holding political office, unless such persons shall have been naturalized according to the laws of the United States; and the exclusion of paupers and criminals.

These, Mr. Chairman, I believe, are the distinctive prominent principles of the Know Nothing party. I will commence with the last of them first.

In regard, then, to the exclusion of paupers and criminals from our shores. I suppose there is not a man in all the length and breadth of this great Confederacy, in favor of bringing that class of persons here; besides, the States have the power now, and always have had, as sovereigns, to exclude them from their borders. But as to Congress having the power to say who shall, or who shall not, be an inhabitant, a resident, or a citizen of any particular State, they have no such power, because the States have never surrendered it, or delegated it to Congress. Congress, therefore, could do nothing without the consent of the States upon the subject. But if any effort was about being made by any foreign Power to force a large number of this class of persons upon any one or more of these States, against their will, and the State or States were not able to prevent it for the want of material aid, then, sir, I would be willing to lend all the power of the General Government to aid in their expulsion. But there can be no controversy upon this subject, as no one is in favor of their coming here.

I come now to the second proposition, which is to change the present naturalization law so as to require hereafter a residence of twenty-one years before a foreigner can either become a citizen of the United States, or *vote*, or *hold any office* in the Government, *State* or *National*. And that no State in the Union "*can*" allow them either to vote or hold office in the State on any other terms.

This proposition, Mr. Chairman, contains two clear and distinct principles, and claims the exercise of two separate, distinct, and independent powers—the one of which, taken by itself, is

legal, constitutional, and practicable; while the other, or rather the two together, as a compound, identical proposition, is wholly impracticable, unconstitutional, and subversive of the sovereignty and independence of the States, striking at the very foundations of our free institutions.

I admit that Congress has plenary power, under the existing Constitution, to establish a uniform rule of naturalization, fixing the time and terms upon which a foreigner may become either a citizen of the United States, or hold office under the General Government. But I deny that Congress has any power, under the present Constitution, to say either who shall or who shall not vote, or who shall or who shall not hold office in any of the States of this Union. Congress has no power to dictate to the States what they shall do on either of these subjects—none, sir, none whatever. The States have no right to pass laws respecting the naturalization of foreigners, saying how or when they may be made citizens of the United States—this power has been expressly delegated to Congress; nor has Congress the power to pass laws fixing the time either to vote or hold office in the State—this power is reserved to the States. The Constitution of the United States says, "Congress shall have power to establish a uniform rule of naturalization," but stops there. It does not go on to say that Congress shall also have power to say how long a foreigner or any other person shall live in a State before he may either vote or hold office; nor does the Constitution give to Congress any power whatever over the qualification of the voter in the State, in any shape or form, or to any extent; this power is all reserved to the States, and being reserved to the States, it would be a usurpation in Congress to attempt to exercise any control over it, as the Know Nothing party contend in this proposition.

But, sir, let us see what would be the practical result of this Know Nothing law, denying to the States the power, and declaring they shall not exercise the right of letting any inhabitant of the State either vote or hold office, "unless he complies with the laws of Congress." To illustrate. Suppose the people of Kentucky, on account of some distinguished service rendered, or on any account, were to elect some foreign-born citizen, not naturalized, Governor of that State: do you think that he could be put out of his office by an act of Congress? Do you think that, if he were required by an act of Congress to vacate his office, and was to refuse, that the President would attempt, by an armed force or otherwise, to remove him? Do you think that there is any power anywhere in this great Government to remove him, except in that State? But again: suppose the State of Kentucky were to fix in her organic law, that a foreigner might vote in any of the counties, towns, or voting precincts in that State, in three months, or three days, or even in three hours, next preceding the election: do you think that Congress, under the present Constitution of the United States, has the power to pass a law requiring twenty-one years, and compel the people of Kentucky, against their will, to change that constitution in conformity to the law of Congress? Do you think Congress has any such power as this, under the Constitution? What, sir, Congress remove our Governor because, forsooth, he was not born in the right place, or had not lived there long enough to suit the *peculiar notions* of Congress, before the people elected him? But, suppose him thus removed, who would fill his place? The people would elect no one else, and who would fill his place? Has Congress the power to turn out the Governor of Kentucky, and then say who shall fill his place? If so, where is all our State sovereignty? Gone, sir, gone; perfectly wiped out forever. The States, in place of being separate, independent, sovereign States, clothed with all the attributes of sovereignty, and power, and capabilities of self-government, would be mere dependencies, holding whatever of power they might be *permitted* to exercise as tenants at the *will of Congress*. Why, sir, let any party or any President, let Congress or let any other executive or any other legislative body in the Union, attempt the exercise of such a power in this country, under the existing Constitution, and nothing short of a bloody revolution would be the result.

While, then, I admit that Congress has plenary power, under the present Constitution, to change the naturalization laws, and require any length of residence deemed best by Congress for a foreigner to become a citizen of the United States, or to hold office under the General Government, I maintain that the States have the right, have full power, under the Constitution of the United States, unrestrained, and unrestrainable, by any act of Congress, to allow foreigners to vote or hold office in the State, whether they have been naturalized or not. And to sustain this opinion, I desire to read an extract from a speech of the Hon. Garret Davis, one of the ablest lawyers and most profound jurists in the State of Kentucky. He is one of the most distinguished members of the Know Nothing party in the Union, and was, as I understand, the choice of the southern wing of the party in place of Mr. Fillmore. While I think him entirely in error on the subject of his new political creed, yet I *know him* to be a man of firmness, integrity, and ability, and, in my judgment, his opinions on the subject of the rights and privileges of the States, and the powers of Congress under the Constitution of the United States, are entitled to as high consideration as any member of *his party* in the Union. The speech, from which I read, was delivered by Mr. Davis, in the late Kentucky Constitutional Convention, upon the very question I am now discussing. It was to insert in the new constitution of Kentucky a clause requiring of foreigners a residence of twenty-one years before they should vote or hold office in the State. In speaking to this subject, Mr. Davis said:

"I presume, Mr. President, there can be no doubt upon the point of our competency and right to act upon this subject; and also of our duty to act upon it, if by so doing we can effect any essential good for the country. Congress has the power, and has passed naturalization laws; and it has been assumed that it would infringe the rights of the foreigners who have been naturalized in conformity to the provisions of those laws, for the States to prescribe any other or additional restrictions to their exercise or the right of suffrage in the State governments. It appears to me that this position is wholly fallacious and untenable. The States have the right to confer upon foreigners the elective franchise, and to make them eligible to all the offices of their governments before naturalization, and they have the undoubted power to exclude them, although they have become citizens of the United States; because such citizenship confers upon them only the rights of that government, conceded by the Federal Constitution, and not a single one under any State government." * * * "The

States are sovereign in forming and administering their own governments. They may deny to naturalized foreigners wholly the right of suffrage, and the privilege of holding office; or they may confer both class of rights fully, or with such restrictions, as to time and other circumstances, as they may will."

Now, sir, you will at once see that Mr. Davis, in this extract, concedes what I concede, and maintains what I maintain, to wit: that Congress has plenary power to establish a uniform rule of naturalization, fixing the terms for a foreigner to become a citizen of the United States, but has no power to enforce said law upon the States—no right to interfere with the States in any manner, or to any extent, in saying who shall vote or hold office therein. That he completely annihilates the idea in the Know Nothing platform, claiming that they have, or that Congress has, the power to say where a man must be born, or how long he shall live in the United States, before he can vote or hold office in any of the States in the Union. He shows that the States not only have the power to let foreigners vote and hold office in their own governments before naturalization, but that the whole subject rests with the States; and if the object be to keep foreigners from voting or holding office in any of the States of this Union, you must go to the States, and not to Congress. To sustain Mr. Davis in this position, I will refer you to the past action of both the General Government and the States upon this subject. The present naturalization law requires a residence of five years in the country before a foreigner can become a citizen of the United States; yet nearly half the States in the Union allow them to vote now in from nine months to two years.

Now, if the General Government cannot prevent foreigners voting in the States in twelve or twenty-four months, when the law of naturalization requires five years, how could it be done by extending the time to twenty-one, or even to one hundred years? The extension of the time of naturalization could never increase the power of Congress to enforce it in the States.

But this position assumed by the Know Nothing party, that Congress has the power to prevent the States of this Union from letting a man vote or hold office in the State until he has complied with the law of Congress, would, if carried out, work ruin to the States, and the people of the States, in a very different way. If the power to prevent a man from voting or holding office in the State, because of the want of birth or residence, be in Congress, then the power to prevent a man from voting or holding office for the want of property is in Congress; the power to prevent a man from voting or holding office for the want of land enough, or slaves enough, or money enough, or blood enough, or age enough, is in Congress; and the whole question of the qualification of the voters, and of persons for holding office in the State, would be in Congress. Sir, I will not stop here to comment further upon what might be the ruinous results of such a power concentrated into the hands of a Know Nothing or a Black Republican Congress. I know the Know Nothings say now, that no man shall have any office in the Government, State or National, if they can prevent it, unless he will join their party or preach their doctrines. The Black Republicans say the same; and it might be, that they, if they had the power, would let *no man* vote who would not vote the way *they might think right*. At any rate, I am for keeping the whole power where it is, where it always has been, and where, I trust, it never will cease to be—*in the hands of the* PEOPLE.

I come now, Mr. Chairman, to the first and essential feature in the Know Nothing creed as taught in my district. It is this: they write out, subscribe to, and take a solemn oath to support the following proposition:

"That they will vote for no man for any office, State or National, who is not a native-born American citizen, in favor of Americans ruling America, nor if he be a *Roman Catholic*."

This is the doctrine, sir, which the Know Nothings propagate in my district; this is the doctrine to which they subscribed, and which they took a solemn oath to support, and this is the doctrine which I think unwise, unjust, unconstitutional, intolerant, proscriptive, revolutionary, at war with the highest precepts of our holy religion, and in contravention of the great essential principles of Protestant Christianity. It is unwise because it militates against the best interest of both Church and State, by exciting jealousies, discords, and ill-will between the native-born and naturalized, Protestant and Roman Catholic communities, when there should be only confidence, concord and good will. It is unjust, because it draws an invidious distinction between native-born Catholics and Protestants—granting to one all the privileges guarantied by the Constitution, and withholding them from the other—to wit, eligibility to office. The Constitution makes both eligible; Know Nothingism but one. It is unconstitutional, because it makes the naturalized citizen, and the native-born Roman Catholic citizen ineligible to office, when the Constitution makes them both eligible. It makes religion a test for every office, State or National, when the Constitution says no religious test shall be required for any office under the United States. It is intolerant, because it does not allow a man to worship God as he pleases, without curtailing his privileges, if he become a Roman Catholic. It is proscriptive, because it places the Roman Catholic and the naturalized citizen beyond the protection afforded by the Constitution, of eligibility for office, and denounces them as dangerous and unworthy. It is revolutionary, because, if successful, it nullifies the Constitution, and makes it a dead letter. It does that, indirectly, by a secret oath-bound political organization, which they cannot, and which they dare not, attempt to do by positive law. It is at war withthe highest precepts of our holy religion, because it violates that golden rule—that rule of rules—laid down by the Savior of the world, when he said: "Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you; and whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them." This is the rule upon which our Savior said rested the law and the prophets; and this is the rule that this Know Nothing plank violates. They persecute and proscribe Catholics, when they themselves would rather be burned, and would be burned at the stake, before they would suffer the Catholics to organize in this country and do, or endeavor to do, just what they are doing or endeavoring to do themselves. I

know, they say that they do not call it proscription; neither do the Black Republican party call it proscription when they say to us of the South, that they want us to furnish men and money, blood and treasure, to purchase and acquire large tracts of territory, and then say to us: "Why, you cannot enter upon any of this territory unless you give up your slaves. It is all dedicated to freedom. Freedom is national and slavery sectional; you cannot enter there." But, sir, I call it proscription of the deepest, darkest, and most objectionable character. I call it unjust, revolutionary. I know they deny that they proscribe Catholics; but I ask you, Mr. Chairman, I ask them, and I ask the country, what would be the result if they would strike out of their creed the word Roman Catholic, and insert the word Baptist? I ask you, what would be the instantaneous result, if they were to do that? Why, sir, the whole country would be in a blaze in a week. I ask you, then, what the result would be if they were to strike out Roman Catholic from their creed and insert Presbyterian? Where would the Know Nothing party stand, even in one day's time, and what would be the state of feeling produced by such an organization? Why, the fire of discord would flash like electricity from one end of the Government to the other. Well, let them then strike out Roman Catholic from their creed and insert Methodist, and how long would it be before we should see a war commenced in this country, the end of which no man could foresee?

Then, sir, if that is not enough, let me ask my colleague and you, Mr. Chairman, and the country, suppose all the churches in the United States were to form themselves into just such a secret, oath-bound, political organization as the Know Nothings now have, and have it written in a constitution as they now have it written in their constitution, and swear, as they have sworn, about the Catholics and naturalized citizens, that not a man in the United States, no matter how good or how great, no matter how pious or how patriotic, should ever have any office in the Government, State or National, unless he belonged to some one of these churches: how long do you think, sir, it would be before "American blood would be shed upon American soil?" How long, under an organization like this, would it be before every purling, babbling streamlet and rill in our land, the waters of which now run so limpid and pure, would be crimsoned with the blood of our brothers? Sir, to use a strong phrase, I think it would be immediately, if not sooner. And, why, Mr. Chairman? Why would the Know Nothing platform produce a revolution quicker with Roman Catholics stricken out, and any other one of the Protestant denominations inserted? Why would it produce revolution with all denominations stricken out, and unbelievers inserted? There would be no change of principle, and why the revolution? Why, sir, because the whole principle is wrong; because it is unjust; because it is unconstitutional; because it would take from a large portion of our fellow-citizens their birthright, secured to them by the Constitution and form of government won for them by our revolutionary fathers. Well, sir, if it would be wrong as applicable to the Baptist, wrong as applicable to the Presbyterian, wrong as applicable to the Methodist, and wrong as applicable to the great outside party, that are not members of any church, why, in the name of reason, in the name of justice, in the name of the Constitution and the Bible, is it not wrong as applicable to native-born Catholics and naturalized citizens? Sir, it is all wrong. I am a native and a Protestant, and I enter, here, my protest against it as a native and Protestant. I call upon Protestants and natives to enter their protest; to do unto the Catholic and naturalized citizen, as they would have the Catholic and the naturalized citizen to do unto them.

The great distinctive idea, the great essential principle, which gave to Martin Luther all his greatness and glory, his religion its popularity, and the civilized world the glorious benefits of Protestant Christianity, was, that no man's civil or political privileges should ever be either increased or diminished on account of his religious faith—that a man's religious faith was purely a matter between him and his Maker, and that he should be left free upon that subject from any sort of restrictions or disabilities, civil or political. It is this great principle that gave Martin Luther his influence, and his religion its power. It was its incontrovertible and irresistible truth—its impartial and inflexible justice—and its comprehensive charity or universal benevolence, that enabled it to revolutionize the religions of the Old World. And being transplanted into the New, has given form and shape to this great Republic, where, unrestraining and itself unrestrained, it has since continued to flourish and grow, and is now flourishing, an undying evergreen, nourished and sustained by its own divine principle, the freedom of religion and the equality of rights. Yes, sir, it was this great, this glorious principle, that won for Martin Luther a world-wide fame, and gave to his religion all its strength. It is this very principle—yes, this very principle—that gives Protestantism its strength to-day. It is this very principle that has given our own Government, in time past, its strength at home and abroad, and it is this very principle, and *this principle only*, that can make it *imperishable*. Give us freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, and equality of rights, and, sir, I fear no danger. Our Government and her institutions would then be as imperishable as our principles are true, just, and eternal.

But they say the foreign-born citizen is unfaithful to his country—not to be trusted, in peace or in war, and that Catholics owe a higher allegiance to the Pope. Let me now allude very briefly to these two ideas. They say the naturalized citizen must be forever ostracized and proscribed, because he is dangerous and untrustworthy. They make no difference, no exception. No matter how brave, how wise, how pious, how patriotic, the naturalized citizen may be, with one fell swoop of Know Nothingism they all go down together. Now, sir, I will say nothing of the gallant De Kalb, nor Kosciusco, nor Steuben, nor of all those who have fought side by side with the native in every battle from Boston to California.

But, to show to what extremes of folly and injustice men may sometimes go, I will point you to the case of the immortal Shields, of Cerro Gordo memory. Look at him, sir, in that great battle! See him in the midst of the fight, with

his face to the foe! Witness his valorous deeds and heroic daring! See him fall, mortally wounded as was supposed, bleeding at every pore, and pouring his blood out like water in the defense of the rights, the honor, and the glory of the American flag! See him by his bravery, his generalship, and his deeds of daring, writing, in his own blood, one of the brightest pages in our country's history! See him, then, sir, here in the councils of the nation, as a Senator from a free State! Witness his votes, and see the conservatism and nationality of his political record! Though from a free State, and abolitionism threatening on every side—though born in a foreign land, and only allied to us by adoption, did he prove unfaithful to the Constitution and the country? Did he not, sir, in 1850—true to his country and to her Constitution—true to every State and every section—take his stand, side by side—with the venerable Cass, the giant Douglas, the immortal Clay, the renowned Webster, and though last yet not least, the great Pennsylvanian, the present gallant standard-bearer of the faithful old Democracy for the Presidency? Did he not again come up here, in 1854, and with Douglas, Cass, Dixon, and the conservative, national men of every section and of all parties unite in passing the Kansas-Nebraska bill, and thus, true to his principles in 1850, carry out, in *spirit* and *in substance*, the great doctrine of non-intervention and the right of self-government, the essential element of the compromise measures of that year? This, sir, is his record, and yet they say he cannot be trusted. Notwithstanding all his valor and patriotism—notwithstanding all his faithfulness and service to his adopted country, he could not now, according to the doctrines of Know Nothingism and Black Republicanism be elected to the humblest office in the Government, State or National. He has already fallen a victim to both. Yes, to both. It was by the united vote of both the Black Republican and Know Nothing parties, that General Shields, with his conservatism and nationality, was turned out of the Senate, and Judge Trumbull, with his sectional, abolition, Black Republican doctrines, put in. Yet, sir, these parties are calling upon the country to discard all former political associations—all former political principles, and join with them to put down such men as General Shields, and to elevate to power such men as Judge Trumbull. To put down the men who voted for the fugitive slave law, and the Kansas-Nebraska bill, in conformity to the Constitution—to secure the constitutional rights of all—and to put men in power who will repeal them both, or trample them like trash under their feet—sir, shall we do it? The people will decide in November next.

But the Know Nothings say that foreign-born naturalized citizens will prove treacherous in war; and to prove it in my district during the canvass they talked a great deal about the desertion of the legion of St. Patrick in the Mexican war. They say that that legion was composed of all foreigners, and Catholics at that, and that they deserted at the bidding of the Catholic priests in Mexico. Now, I was not there, and do not know exactly all that passed between the priests in Mexico and that legion; but, sir, I do not believe a word about their deserting on that account. The legion was composed of about two hundred men, about fifty only of whom were foreign-born, and the balance all natives of our own country; and as I find the Know Nothings mistaken as to who composed the legion, I feel constrained to believe they were mistaken also as to the cause of their deserting. I will read, in proof of what I have said, as to the persons composing that legion, an extract from the speech made in the late Kentucky Constitutional Convention by Mr. Kelly. In speaking of the legion of St. Patrick, Mr. Kelly said, in reply to Mr. Davis, of Bourbon:

"Sir, the gentleman has spoken of the legion of St. Patrick, in Mexico. It was composed of something near two hundred men—thirty-six of whom were Irishmen, ten Germans, two Frenchmen, and one Englishman—(I refer, sir, to the letters of Lieutenant Denman, of the United States Army, and Lieutenant Cantwell, who fell at the Guata, a gallant son of the Palmetto State.) Who were the remainder? Native-born Americans, I blush to own it."

Now, sir, in regard to the faithfulness and valor of the foreign-born soldiery in the Mexican war and in the war of 1812-15, I will read the two letters of General Scott, who was on the ground, and is presumed to know all about it. These letters were published during the last presidential contest, and full credit given to them by all General Scott's friends then. They read as follows:

WASHINGTON, *March* 1, 1851.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your kind letter of the 8th instant, I take pleasure in saying that, grateful for the partial estimate you place on my public services, you do me no more than justice in assuming that I entertain "kind and liberal views toward our naturalized citizens." Certainly, it would be impossible for me to recommend or support any measure intended to exclude them from a just and full participation in all civil and political rights now secured to them by our republican laws and institutions.

It is true that in a season of unusual excitement, some years ago, when both parties complained of fraudulent practices in the naturalization of foreigners, and when there seemed to be danger that native and adopted citizens would be permanently arrayed against each other in hostile factions, I was inclined to concur in the opinion, then avowed by many leading statesmen, that some modification of the naturalization laws might be necessary in order to prevent abuses, allay strife, and restore harmony between the different classes of our people. But later experience and reflection have entirely removed this impression, and dissipated my apprehensions.

In my recent campaign in Mexico, a very large proportion of the men under my command were your countrymen, (Irish,) Germans, &c. I witnessed with admiration their zeal, fidelity, and valor in maintaining our flag in the face of every danger. Vieing with each other and our native-born soldiers in the same ranks in patriotism, constancy, and heroic danger, I was happy to call them brothers in the field, as I shall always be to serve them as countrymen at home.

I remain, dear sir, with great esteem, yours truly,
WINFIELD SCOTT.

WILLIAM E. ROBINSON, Esq.

—

WASHINGTON, *March* 11, 1851.

GENTLEMEN: I have received your note inviting me to join you at Philadelphia, in the celebration of the approaching St. Patrick's day—an honor which, I regret, the press of business obliges me to decline.

You do me but justice in supposing me to feel a lively interest in Ireland and her sons. Perhaps no man, certainly no American, owes so much to the valor and blood of Irishmen as myself. Many of them marched and fought under my command in the war of 1812-1815, and many more—thousands—in the recent war with Mexico, not one of whom was ever known to turn his back upon the enemy or a friend.

I salute you, gentlemen, with my cordial respects,
WINFIELD SCOTT.

R. TALER, C. MCCAULAY, P. W. CONROY, and J. MCCENN, Esqs., *Committee, &c., &c.*

But, sir, show the Know Nothings all this—show them that the foreign-born soldier is good and true, valorous and patriotic—show them that an extension of the naturalization laws to twenty-one years would be inoperative in the States without their consent—show them that the naturalization laws have nothing to do with the privilege of voting—that it only gives the foreigner the privilege of suing and being sued, inheriting and transmitting property as native-born citizens do—and simply throws around him the protecting arm of the Government at home and abroad—show them all this, and that the only way, under the existing laws, that a foreigner can obtain the right to vote in this country is, from the State in which he may live—shew them all this, and satisfy them of its truth, prove it by their own friends, Mr. Davis and General Scott, and yet they fly off and say, "I do not care, there are too many coming to our country; they will take up the public land from us and our children, and we must put a stop to it. If we do not, they will get all the good land, impoverish us and our children, overrun the country, and break down the Government." This is what they said last summer in my district. In answer to that Know Nothing argument, I will simply read an extract from the Newburg speech of the Know Nothing candidate for the Presidency, (Mr. Fillmore.) In his Newburg speech, Mr. Fillmore says:

"I have no hostility to foreigners; I have witnessed their deplorable condition in the old country, and *God forbid* that I should add to their suffering by refusing them an asylum in this. I would throw the gates *wide open*, and *invite* the oppressed of every land to partake of the blessings of our laws and country. I would only exclude from this emigration the pauper and the criminal."

Now, sir, this is a curious speech for a Know Nothing to make—for a man who desired or expected to get Know Nothing votes in my district. I ran against the regular nominee of the Know Nothing party; the issues were all and fully made; the ground assumed was, that it was a war between Protestants and Catholics—natives and foreigners—that the Catholics belonged to the Pope, and the foreigners, if suffered to come to the country, would take possession of all the rich lands in the West, and our children be left destitute. The cry there was "Down with the Catholics, and keep out the foreigners!" This was the ground assumed, and this the argument used, by the Know Nothings in my district. Yes, sir, "Keep out the foreigners," was the constant, ceaseless cry, there and then made. And little did I think, that in the very first speech made by the Know Nothing candidate for the Presidency, he would join issue with his Know Nothing brethren in my part of the country. Little did I think, while his friends in my part of the country were crying, "Shut the doors of immigration, and keep out all the foreigners!" that Mr. Fillmore, their candidate for the Presidency, would be, on the other end of the Union, crying "Fling the *doors wide open* and *invite* in all the foreigners of every kindred tribe and tongue, except the criminals and paupers!" Little did I think, sir, while the Know Nothings in my district were traveling *night* and *day*, getting up a party to keep the foreigners from coming here to take all our fine country, that their candidate for the presidency would be over here, in New York, getting up another party, to invite all the foreigners in, especially, as he says, to "*partake of the blessings*" of this good country—the very blessings which the Know Nothings in my district were endeavoring to save, as they said, for themselves and their children. I tell you, Mr. Chairman, this is a very curious speech for a Know Nothing to make, who wishes votes out my way.

Now, sir, it is none of my business; but if I was allowed to advise a Know Nothing, I would advise Mr. Fillmore to take back that speech, or get his friends to call another big meeting, just as they do when they go to *change their old*, or *make a new*, platform; and let him make it over, so that he *might* crowd it a little more with "*verbiage*," and a little less with distinct, sensible ideas; knock out some of the prominent ideas altogether, or shake them together and mix them up in some way, so as to hide or cover up that *pressing iniitation* he has given, and called God to witness it, to all the world and the rest of mankind, (except criminals and paupers,) to come over here and enjoy just as much of our *fine, rich lands* as they please.

I tell you, Mr. Chairman, this is a dangerous speech to send electioneering for votes out in my State, where the people have such a strong passion for *rich lands*, and such an intense American horror for *foreigners*. Yes, sir, here is a direct issue between Mr. Fillmore and his friends, in my part of the country, in faith and doctrine. What will they do? Will they repudiate their doctrine to save their candidate? or will they repudiate their candidate to save their doctrine? The people will see at the election.

I have said now, Mr. Chairman, all I desire to say about the naturalized foreigner. Let us see if the charges made by the Know Nothing party against the Catholic church in this country can be sustained, according to the rule laid down by my honorable colleague, Mr Cox, the other day, to wit, that every party should be considered the only *true* and *legitimate* expopent of its own views. Now, this is a correct rule, and one by which every party in the country should be willing to stand or fall. Let us then see, according to this rule, if the Catholics in this country are guilty or innocent of the charges preferred against them by the Know Nothing party. What, then, are the charges? They contended that the Roman Catholic Church in this country owe an allegiance to the Pope of Rome, over and above the allegiance they owe and acknowledge to the Government of the United States; that, therefore, they are unfit for office, and unworthy to be trusted:

That the Pope of Rome, by virtue of his office as the spiritual head of the church, claims, and has the power, to absolve any of the members of the Catholic church throughout the world, from their oath of allegiance to their respective Governments:

That it is a part and parcel of the Catholic creed, that there is no obligation upon a Catholic to keep faith, or comply with the contracts they may make, with those that differ with them in their religious faith:

That a Catholic cannot be faithful to the Pope, and to the Government in which he lives, provided the Pope and his Government should be at war with each other. They charge that, in that event, the Catholic citizen would be required by

his creed, to surrender at the bidding, and in favor of the Pope, and consequently should not, and as far as they are concerned, they shall not have any office in the Government, civil or military. These, Mr. Chairman, are the positions assumed by the Know Nothing party in my district, in regard to Roman Catholics, during the canvass the past summer.

Now, sir, I approve the rule laid down by my honorable colleague the other day. I think it a good one, and I desire to try the Know Nothing party and the Catholic party by it. I have given you the opinions and doctrines attributed to the Catholics by the Know Nothings. Now let us see what they say about themselves. I will first read an extract from a speech of the Hon. Mr. Rudd, made in the late Kentucky constitutional convention, in answer to a speech of the Hon. Garret Davis, concerning foreigners and Catholics. In regard to the charge that Catholics, in this country owe a higher allegiance to the Pope of Rome than to the Government of the United States, Mr. Rudd says:

"The gentleman from Bourbon (Mr. Davis) has again and again, in the course of his long speech, spoken of the political or temporal allegiance which he asserts the Catholics of this and other countries owe to the Pope. Now, I deny that they acknowledge or owe this allegiance to him. It is untrue; it is entirely a mistake on the part of the gentleman." * * * * "It is not the first time that this charge has been made against Catholics and their religion; but whenever and wherever made, it has been denied and fully refuted."

Now, according to the rule laid down by my colleague, that each party is to be the only true and legitimate exponent of its own views and doctrines, I will leave it to you, Mr. Chairman, and the country, to say whether injustice has not been done to the Catholics by the Know Nothing party? Mr. Rudd, who is a Catholic, and informed upon the subject of the Catholic creed, here denies, flatly and most unequivocally, the doctrine of a higher allegiance to the Pope attributed to them by the Know Nothing party. But, sir, I will read again an extract from the speech of the honorable Mr. Spaulding, made in the same convention and in answer to the same speech of the honorable Mr. Davis. In speaking of the higher allegiance which he was charged with owing to the Pope, Mr. Spaulding said:

"I owe no allegiance to any man, or set of men, under heaven, save the Commonwealth of Kentucky, and to the Government of the United States." * * * "I owe no allegiance to the Pope of Rome, or to the cardinals, bishops, or priests; they have no right to send any persons here to cut our throats. The Pope has no more authority to alter or change the principles of the Church of Rome than has the President to alter or change the Constitution of the United States. If he dare to do it, he might be called to account for it by me, or anybody else belonging to the Church."

This, sir, is another plain, flat, unequivocal contradiction that Catholics in this country owe a higher allegiance to the Pope than they do to their country.

I will read now, sir, an extract from the speech of Hon. Mr. Kelly, made in the same convention, at the same time, and in answer to the same speech of Mr. Davis. Mr. Kelly says:

"The gentleman [Mr. Davis] says we owe civil and religious obedience to the Pope. Sir, I doubt not he believes so; but I *know* to the reverse. I am a Catholic in faith—I would die before I would yield it." * * * * * * "I know what the faith is, for I have been reared a Catholic—by an educated Irishman—my father, who understood his faith, who taught it to his children, without constraint, and who left them free to choose among the six hundred and sixty-six faiths now in the world. He did not say to me, be a Catholic; but told me to read, not alone histories, of which he had many, Catholic and Protestant, but the dogmas of the churches, to acquaint myself thoroughly with their arcana, and not to stick in the bark. I think I I have done so. *He* has gone to receive the reward of a life spent in the service of his adopted country, and the maintenance of the faith; while I, of his sons, stand alone.

Mr. Kelly then goes on to state, further, that

"It will be remembered by this body that, in 1828, Daniel O'Connell was elected to the British Parliament from the county of Clare. Sir Vesey Fitzgerald contested his election; and when O'Connell was required to swear that Catholicity taught rebellion and disorder and sedition, he refused the vile oath. What was the result? Though one of the greatest lawyers of the world, he was ejected from Parliament, and a new writ of election was issued. He offered again, and was again elected; and the House of Commons, fearing the people, caused a committee to be raised, and directed them to inquire of the Catholic college of Maynooth, in Ireland, the college of Louvaine, in Belgium, of Bologna, in Italy, and the college of Cologne, in Prussia, and, I think, the Propaganda of Rome, if the Catholics owed civil or temporal allegiance to the Pope? They all answered, *No!* Dr. Doyle, one of the most distinguished *Catholic theologians* that ever lived, asserted the same; and further, that such a doctrine had never existed in the Church."

I will now read an extract from the speech of Hon. J. R. Chandler, of Pennsylvania, delivered in this Hall on the 10th day of January, 1855, in regard to the charges preferred against the Catholic church in this country by the Know Nothing party, with reference to the charge of superior temporal allegiance to the Pope. He says:

"Mr. Chairman, I deny that the Bishop of Rome has, or that he claims for himself, the right to interfere with the political relations of any other country than that of which he is himself the sovereign. I mean—and I have no desire to conceal any point—that I deny to the Bishop of Rome the right, resulting from his divine office, to interfere in the relations between subjects and their sovereigns, between citizens and their Governments."

He goes on further to state—

"I may be allowed, without the imputation of vanity, to make one more direct allusion to myself and my creed. And, sir, clearly and distinctly do I deny, that the power of the Pope extends one grain beyond his spiritual relations with the members of his Church, or infringes, in the least degree, upon the political allegiance which any Roman Catholic of thise ountry may owe to the Government and Constitution of the United States. And that this disavowal of a divided fealty may not be regarded as a mere generality, I give it explicitness by declaring that, if by any providence the Bishop of Rome should become possessed of armies and a fleet, and, in a spirit of conquest, or in any other spirit, should invade the territory of the United States, or assail the rights of our country, he would find no more earnest antagonists than the Roman Catholics. And, for myself, if not here in this Hall to vote supplies for a defending army, or if too old to take part in the active defense, I should, if alive, be at least in my chamber, or at the foot of the altar, imploring God for the safety of my country and the defeat of the invaders."

This, Mr. Chairman, is to the point, direct and unequivocal; and according to the rule, that every man shall be the exponent of his own views, shows, beyond cavil or controversy, that flagrant injustice has been done to the Catholics in this country by the Know Nothing party, in attributing to them views and opinions which they utterly repudiate. But, sir, I desire to read again an extract from a letter of the late Dr. England, bishop of Charleston, to an Episcopal clergyman, in regard to the very questions now at issue. In speaking of the charges preferred against the

Catholics—of their higher civil and political allegiance to the Pope, he says:

"Let the Pope and cardinals, and all the powers of the Catholic world united, make the least encroachment upon that Constitution, [the Constitution of the United States,] and we will protect it with our lives. Summon a general council—let that council interfere in our electing but an assistant to a turnkey of a prison—we deny its right; we reject its usurpation. Let that council lay a tax of but one cent only upon any one of our churches, we will *not* pay it. Yet we are most obedient Papists."

Again, from Bishop England, in regard to the charge, that the Catholic cannot be faithful to the Pope and to the Government in which he lives, provided his Government and the Pope be at variance. In speaking of this particular charge, Bishop England says:

"I can be faithful to the Pope and to the Government under which I live, I care not whether that Government be administered by a Papist, a Protestant, by a Jew, by a Mohammedan, or by a Pagan. It is, then, untrue to assert, as you have done, that a consistent Papist and a dutiful subject of a Protestant administration must be incompatible."

I will read one more extract from Right Rev. Dr. England, in confirmation of this same point. It is so pointed, so clear, and so conclusive, I cannot forbear. I ask your special attention, Mr. Chairman, to this extract. In speaking of the Constitution of the United States he says:

"The American Constitution leaves its citizens in perfect freedom to have whom they please to regulate their spiritual concerns. But if the Pope were to declare war against America, and any Roman Catholic, under the pretext of spiritual obedience, were to refuse to oppose this temporal aggressor, he would deserve to be punished for his refusal, because he owes it to this Government to maintain its rights. And spiritual power does not, and cannot, destroy the claim which the Government has upon him."

This, Mr. Chairman, is not only pointed but irresistibly conclusive, as to whether a Catholic can be faithful to the Pope, and faithful to his own Government, provided they be at war. Why, sir, Bishop England here states, in so many words, that if the old Pope himself were to declare war against the United States, and any Catholic in the Union were to refuse to repel him *as an aggressor*, he would deserve to be punished, *because* his obligations to defend his own country and maintain her rights are higher and above his obligations to the Pope. Nothing could be more pointed, nothing more conclusive, than this statement of Bishop England in regard to the obligations that the Catholic citizen in this country owes to the Pope of Rome.

But, again, I will read from the speech of Hon. Mr. Chandler, embracing the opinion of the Pope himself (p. 115) upon the points in controversy. The extract is as follows:

"Mr. Chairman, the same circumstances which induced that great statesman, Mr. Pitt, to address the six Catholic Universities, led the Roman Catholic Archbishops of Ireland to address the Pope himself on the subject, and the answer was as clear and explicit as those of the Universities. Solemn deliberation was given in the congregation of Cardinals, and the response was made in the most formal manner, as declaring the doctrine of the Catholic Church on the subject involved in the questions. I copy from an authentic report:

"'The Roman Catholic Archbishops of Ireland, at their meeting in Dublin, in 1791, addressed a letter to the Pope, wherein they described the misrepresentations that had been recently published of their consecration oath, and the great injury to the Catholic body arising from them.' * * * *

"'After due deliberation at Rome, the congregation of Cardinals appointed to superintend the ecclesiastical affairs of these kingdoms, returned an answer, (of which the following is an extract,) by the authority and command of his holiness:

"'*Most Illustrious and most Reverend Lords and Brothers:*

"'We perceive from your late letter the great uneasiness you labor under since the publication of a pamphlet entitled *The present State of the Church of Ireland*, from which our detractors have taken occasion to renew the old calumny against the Catholic religion with increased acrimony; namely: *that this religion is, by no means, compatible with the safety of Kings and Republics; because, as they say, the Roman Pontiff being the father and master of all Catholics, and invested with such great authority, that he can free the subjects of other kingdoms from their fidelity and oaths of allegiance to Kings and Princes*, he has it in his power, they contend, to cause disturbances and injure the public tranquility of kingdoms with ease. We wonder that you could be uneasy at these complaints, especially after your most excellent brother and apostolical fellow-laborer, the Archbishop of Cashel, and other strenuous defenders of the rights of the Holy See, had evidently refuted and explained away these slanderous reproaches in their celebrated writings. In this controversy, a most accurate discrimination should be made between the genuine rights of the Apostolic See, and those that are imputed to it by innovators of this age for the purpose of calumniating. *The See of Rome never taught that faith is not to be kept with the heterodox: that an oath to Kings separated from the Catholic communion can be violated: that it is lawful for the Bishop of Rome to invade their temporal rights and dominions. We, too, consider an attempt or design against the life of Kings and Princes, even under the pretext of religion, as a* horrid *and* detestable crime.'"

You will see, Mr. Chairman, that the Pope disavows, positively and unequivocally, the doctrines and powers attributed to him by his enemies. He certainly ought to be considered good and conclusive authority, according to the rule laid down by my honorable colleague—that every party should be the only true exponent of its own views.

I will read now an extract from a speech of the Hon. Garret Davis, who, as I before said, was the choice of the southern wing of the Know Nothing party for the Presidency, in place of Mr. Fillmore. I read this extract to show that in the judgment of that great man, at the time he made his speech in the late Kentucky Constitutional Convention, it would be wrong to attempt to exclude native-born Catholics from office; because, as he says in the extract, which I will now read: "It is their birthright; and they are as competent to take charge of those high trusts as he, (Mr. Davis,) or any other person." It reads as follows:

"I have known Roman Catholics, residents of Maryland, of Louisiana, and of our State, excellent people—so far as I could judge the heart of man, as good as any whatever. I have had the happiness to make the acquaintance of several gentlemen, members of this body, who, I am informed, are of that faith; and none here have a larger share of my esteem and confidence. My belief is, I know no better men anywhere—none more fit to assume the responsibilities of self government, or to discharge the duties of good citizens, both public and private. These men, and all Catholics born and educated in this country of light and liberty, are, and were, by me, intended to remain far from the operation of any principle which I have submitted to the convention; because our country and its institutions were as much their birthright as mine, and they as well qualified to take charge of both as myself or any others."

This, sir, is the testimony of a political opponent of the Catholics—and his testimony ought to be conclusive with his own party—and if it is, it forever settles the questions as to the Catholics in this country.

I desire now, Mr. Chairman, to read a brief history of the investigation and adjudication of this whole subject by the British Parliament; one which, I think, should put the question, as to the

power of the Pope over the Catholics in this country, forever at rest.

The question of granting to Ireland a part of the privileges enjoyed by the people of Great Britain, being under consideration, the question was raised with regard to the asserted power of the Roman Pontiff to interfere in internal affairs of other Governments. This being the question, and producing great excitement, the three following questions were prepared by Mr. Pitt, Prime Minister of England in 1789, through the Catholics of London, to six of the most learned Catholic universities of Europe, viz: of Paris, of Douay, of Louvain, of Acala, of Salamanca, and of Valladolid. The questions are pointed, and the answers unequivocal. They read as follows:

"1. *Question.* Has the Pope, or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, any civil authority, power, jurisdiction, or preëminence whatsoever within the realm of England?

"*Answer.* Neither the Pope, nor the Cardinals, nor any body of men, nor any other person of the Church of Rome, hath any civil authority, civil power, civil jurisdiction, or civil preëminence whatsoever in any kingdom, consequently none in the kingdom of England.

"2. *Question.* Can the Pope, or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual, of the Church of Rome, absolve or dispense with his Majesty's subjects from their oath of allegiance, upon any pretext whatever?

"*Answer.* Neither the Pope, nor the Cardinals, nor any body of men, nor any individual of the Church of Rome, can, by the virtue of the keys, absolve or release the subjects of the King of England from their oath of allegiance.

"3. *Question.* Is there any principle in the tenets of the Catholic faith by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or other persons differing from them in their religious opinions, in any transaction, either of a public or a private character?

"*Answer.* There is no tenet in the Catholic churches by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or those who differ from them in matters of religion. The tenet that it is lawful to break faith with heretics is so repugnant to common honesty and the opinions of Catholics, that there is nothing of which those who have defended the Catholic faith against Protestants have complained more heavily, than the malice and calumny of their adversaries in imputing this tenet to them.

These, Mr. Chairman, are the questions put by Mr. Pitt, through the Catholics of London, in 1789, to the six universities before mentioned, and these are the answers to said questions, given by the university at Paris, in March, 1789; and they are ratified and confirmed by the other five universities—all of which I have before me, but not time to read—Douay, Louvain, Alcala, Salamanca, and Valadolid, though not in the identical letters and words, yet in sentiment identical and unequivocal.

Now, sir, what becomes of the charges preferred against the Catholics in this country after these responses, and according to the rule laid down by my colleague, [Mr. Cox,] that every party should be considered the only true and legitimate exponent of its own views and doctrines? Shall we discard my colleague's rule, and say that the Catholics are not, and should not be, considered the only true and legitimate exponents of their own views? Shall we say that my honorable colleague's rule is a good one by which to try Know Nothings, but a bad one by which to try Catholics? Shall we, to save the inconsistencies, the absurdities, and cruelties, of Know Nothingism, say that the whole Catholic Church, from the Pope down, (for I have quoted them all,) are a set of ignoramuses, and do not know what they believe? Shall we, to save "Sam" from the universal condemnation of all disinterested men, say that the whole Catholic world are a set of scamps, rapscallions, and liars, who could not, or would not, tell the truth if they knew it? Is it possible, Mr. Chairman, that the cause of Know Nothingism has become so desperate that, in order to sustain it in the great essential element of its strength, we must say of the Church which, of all others in the world, has done most to send the light of literature, science, and *its own peculiar views of religion*, all over the world, is the *only Church* in the world, which is so ignorant that they do not know what they believe; or if they do, that they are so wicked and vile, they will not tell? Shall we render this judgment against that Church? Will "Sam," sir, ask it at our hands? Would it not be more courteous to all parties—would it not be more charitable to conclude, rather, that "Sam" had been a little too hasty in his charges upon that Church; and that as soon as he sees the error of his way, he will, like a wise man, retrace his steps, and like a true knight, and gallant and magnanimous foeman, take back what he finds himself unable to sustain by the evidence.

When the British Parliament received the answers, which I have read, from the six churches referred to, of Paris, &c., they did not say to these universities that they were ignorant, and did not know what they believed, or that they were vile, and would not tell. They received them in the same spirit in which the questions had been propounded; and when they had considered them in Parliament, satisfied as they were that their answers contained the truth, and were a complete refutation of the charges preferred against the Catholics of that country by their enemies, (and they were precisely the same as those now preferred against the same people in this country by the Know-Nothing party,) they removed the disabilities which had been before imposed upon them by law. This is the investigation, the decision, and action upon this great question, by a body of men, all of whom, in their religious faith, stood opposed to the tenets and dogmas of the Catholic creed, and in legal and literary attainments, not surpassed by any other in the world. Sir, this decision and action of the British Parliament, removing the disabilities from Catholics on account of their religion, formed a new era in her history, and merits our highest consideration. It was not only hailed with joy and thanksgiving by Catholics, but by Protestants also. The imposition of the disabilities on Catholics in England, had not only proved unjust and oppressive upon them, but it had been also a complete clog to the growth of Protestantism.

In a speech of Dr. Chalmers, of the Scotch Presbyterian church, and one of the most learned divines in the world, made at Edinburgh, Scotland, he stated: "That from the day that England commenced the plan of propping up Protestantism, and suppressing Catholicism by law—from that very day, Catholicism grew, and Protestantism waned; that the law of disabilities upon Catholics, stood like a wall of fire between them and Protestants; that they looked upon Protestants as their enemies, seeking to oppress and crush them, and they would not therefore hear them preach, and could not, consequently, be

converted by them." It is in this country as it was in that. If you wish to build up the Catholic, and put down the Protestant church, impose disabilities on Catholics, and *prop up* the Protestant by law. If you want to build up the Protestant church and convert the Catholics, strike out all disabilities, and let all be free. All that is wanted to make Protestantism the religion of the world, is a free circulation of a faithful translation of the Scriptures, in the vernacular language of every nation upon earth. A religion that requires a law of the State to commend, or the sword and strong arm of the Government to enforce it, in my judgment is not *the religion* of the Bible, as taught by Jesus of Nazareth, nor is it the religion of Protestants as taught by Martin Luther. But let us see if Protestantism needs any props of law, either directly or indirectly, in this country. How many Protestant, and how many Catholic churches have we in the United States?

I have shown you that the Catholics would not subvert our glorious Government if they could. I now purpose to show you that they could not, if they would. Let us, then, see. I read from the census of 1850, taken under a special act of Congress, from table on page 133, that the total number of churches of all denominations in the United States is thirty-eight thousand one hundred and eighty-three; of that number only one thousand two hundred and twenty-seven are Catholic, showing about thirty-seven thousand Protestant to one thousand Catholic. Does this look like the Catholic church in this country was about to overrun the Protestant? Does this look like they could, if they would, soon get the possession and control of the Government? Thirty-seven thousand to one thousand, and yet there is danger! To say this is to acknowledge that error is mightier than truth—the few more powerful than the many. Such a decision might be all right and proper in a Know Nothing council, but in no other council upon earth. I am a Protestant, and I will not so stultify myself, and reflect upon the church of which I am a member, as to say, that thirty-seven Protestant churches, in a free and republican Government, with truth on their side, could not and would not, in any controversy, in any contingency, or in any country, be able to withstand one Catholic church, with no arms of offense or defense but error. The truth of the gospel of Christ is mighty, and will prevail; and needs no other sword than the sword of the spirit—the word of God. Give us, then, what was won for us by our fathers in the Revolution, and secured to us by our glorious Constitution—the freedom of religion and the equality of rights It is all that Catholics ask; it is all that Protestants need.

I have shown you, Mr. Chairman, two errors in the positions assumed by the Know Nothing party—first, that the Catholic church would not, if it could, and secondly, could not, if it would, control and subvert the Government. I now desire to show another egregious error into which, many of the Know Nothings fell, in my district, and I presume it was the case in other places. They all started out with the general assumption, that the Catholic was by far the richest and most influential church in the United States; and some went so far as to say, that it was actually worth a hundred millions of church property; that it was sweeping over the country with the old Pope at its head, and would, if not checked at once, soon have possession of the Government, destroy our liberties, and forever annihilate our free institutions. This is the sort of doctrine preached in my country, during my canvass, to rouse the prejudices, to fire the passions and excite the fears of the people. They said there, that Catholics would not tolerate Protestants, and Protestants should not, and as far as they were concerned, they would not, tolerate Catholics. Now let us see what the facts are in regard to this matter. Let us see if the Catholic Church is worth a hundred millions, or if it is richer than any other, or so rich as many others, and all about it, if we can. I will read from the census of the United States, table on page 135, which is as follows:

The Methodist church, worth	$14,825,143
The Presbyterian	14,557,089
The Baptist	11,001,127
The Episcopal	11,384,210
The Roman Catholic	9,256,758
The Congregational	7,970,195
Total value of all the churches	87,446,371

From this table, Mr. Chairman, you will see at once, that, so far from the Catholic being the richest church in the Union, as contended for by many, the Methodist and Presbyterian churches are each worth nearly double the amount of the Catholic; while the Baptist and Episcopal are each worth about one third more. And so far from the Catholic church, as was contended for by some, being worth a hundred millions of property, all the churches in the Union put together are only worth not quite ninety millions—say ninety for even count—and of this ninety millions, the Roman Catholics only have nine; while the Protestants have eighty-one millions. Is it possible, I ask again, that eighty-one millions of Protestant church property, with truth, as all Protestants agree, upon their side, with the unrestrained privilege of preaching it whenever and wherever they please, cannot compete successfully with only nine millions of Catholic church property, without being propped or sustained by the strong arm or political machinery of the Government? Sir, such a state of facts may seem questionable, or look scary, to a Know Nothing in the dark; but to one not initiated, seen in the daytime, and viewed in the light of truth, nothing could appear more preposterous and absurd.

I will now read, Mr. Chairman, an article from the Philadelphia Ledger, showing the relative strength and numbers of almost every church in the United States, and made out from the census tables, to which I have already referred. It reads as follows:

"RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES. The number of religious sects in the United States is twenty, without counting the Chinese Buddhists in California, or sundry minor Christian denominations. The whole number of edifices is about thirty six thousand, capable of accommodating fourteen millions of people. The total value of church property held by these twenty denominations, is nearly ninety millions of dollars—in exact numbers, $86,416,639. The average value of each church and its appurtenances is twenty four hundred dollars. These facts, which are derived from official tables for the census, explode another false notion, which is that there is too much luxury and wealth in American churches.

"The most numerous sect in the United States is the Methodist, the second the Baptist, and the third the Presbyterian. The first has church accommodations for over four millions of worshipers; in other words, the Methodists have

houses of worship for one sixth the entire population. The Baptists have accommodations for more than three millions, and the Presbyterians for more than two. The fourth sect, in the extent of its accommodations, is the Congregational; the fifth the Episcopalian; and the sixth the Roman Catholic. The number of churches belonging to the three leading denominations does always follow this proportion, however. The Methodist, for example, while they can accommodate twice as many worshipers as the Presbyterians, have three times as many churches. The Roman Catholics, though sixth on the list as regards accommodations, stand seventh in the number of their churches. Of the principal sects, that which has the smallest edifices for worship, is the Methodists; and those which have the largest are the Unitarians and the Dutch Reformed. The smallest denomination is the Swedenborgian, and the next the Mennonite. There are no less than fifty-two Tunker churches, and thirty five thousand worshipers. The Friends, so numerous in this city, have accommodations for about three hundred thousand, or but little more than one hundredth of the entire population of the United States.

"The richest denomination is the Methodist, which is set down in the census tables at $14,826,148. The next is the Presbyterian, which is rated at $14,557,089. The Episcopal, which in number of churches stands fifth, ranks third for its church property, being estimated at $11,384,210. The fourth is the Baptist, $11,001,127; the fifth the Roman Catholic, $9,256,758; and the sixth the Congregational, $7,970,195. Of these various sects, the two which sympathize the most in doctrine, are the Congregationalists and Presbyterians—both adhering to the Westminster Catechism, and differing only in their form of government, the one being republican, the other democratic. Together these two sects have over six thousand churches, can seat nearly three millions of worshipers, and hold church property to the value of more than twenty-two millions."

But it is said that in no Catholic country upon earth will they tolerate Protestants. Is this true? Let us see. What, sir, are the facts? Why, in Austria, the oldest Catholic monarchy in Europe, there were, in 1851, about 22,000,000 of Roman Catholics, and in all other denominations about 10,000,000. In Prussia there were, in 1849, 10,016,798 Protestants, and only 6,079,613 Catholics; while in Switzerland, in 1850, there were only 80,000 Catholics and 153,000 Protestants; and in France, to say nothing of the other kingdoms of Europe, in Catholic France, we have 2,000,000 Protestants—30,000 of them in the city of Paris—and they there pay our Protestant preachers now, out of the public treasury. In all Great Britain, according to the census, the Catholics have only 570 churches, while the Methodists have near 12,000, and the Church of England 14,078; the Baptists 2,500. Why, sir, the King of Belgium is a Protestant, though his subjects are mostly Catholics. The King of Saxony is a Catholic, though most of his subjects are Protestants. The King of Greece is a Catholic, though most of his subjects are of the Greek Church. I only refer you to these facts and figures, Mr. Chairman, to show you that every assumption of Know Nothingism fails when you come to the proof; and that, while other nations are advancing in Christian civilization, we are about to take a retrograde step.

What else do they say? They say that in all countries, and in every age of the world, has the Catholic religion been inimical to republican government; and that no Republic would stand if put under Catholic control. Why, sir, what are the facts? The first colony in America that ever established the equality of Christians, was the Catholic colony of Maryland, of which this District once formed part. While the Episcopalians were persecuting the Puritans in one section of the country, and the Puritans persecuting the Episcopalians in another, the Catholic colony of Maryland was the only city of refuge for them all. What else? Why, the oldest Republic in the world, is the Republic of San Moreno—not a day's journey from the Eternal City. It has stood for about one thousand four hundred and fifty years, I think, a pure Republic, under the protection of the Pope. Again, the Republic of Andora, in the Spanish Pyrenees. It is a pure democracy, governed by men of its own choice, and under the protection of the Bishop of Urgil. But what else? Why, Kossuth, the great Hungarian, was a Protestant; and he was elected, in the very heart of Austria, the oldest Catholic monarchy in Europe. What for? To revolutionize that Catholic country, to establish a republic. And who sustained and elected him? The Catholics of Hungary. Why, sir, but for the combined armies of France and Austria, the old Pope himself, in less than one year from to-day, would be driven from the Eternal City, or forced to declare in favor of a republican government. Yes, sir, the same republican Catholic spirit which elected Kossuth to revolutionize Austria, would revolutionize Rome in less than a year, if Louis Napoleon and the Czar of all the Russias would only withdraw their armies. And yet, say the Know Nothings, Catholics are always and everywhere inimical to human liberty. Now, read the history of our country, written in the blood of our fathers, showing that, on every battle-field, from Boston to California, in the war of the Revolution, in the war of 1812, and in the war with Mexico, native born and naturalized, Protestant and Roman Catholic, have stood side by side and shoulder to shoulder, and poured their blood out like water, in one common stream, in defense of their common country. Read then the history of Protestantism, written in the blood of the martyrs who fell in defense of the freedom of religion and the equality of rights. Read then the history of the blessed Bible, our old family Bible, which we keep on the stand, written in the blood of the Son of God, and teaching us to do unto others as we would have others do unto us; and then say whether we should not expel from our once happy land all this flummery of Know Nothingism, and leave the Catholic and naturalized citizen where we would have them leave us, if they had the power—free to worship God as we pleased, without stint or mainprize; or, in the beautiful language of the song of the "Pilgrim Fathers,"

> "Leave untouched what here we found,
> Freedom to worship God."

But, again: how have Protestants gained this wonderful foothold in the old countries? By our example, by our religious toleration, by our diplomacy, and by our Protestant missionaries. We have tolerated all religions heretofore, without restraint. By it we have obtained like privileges for Protestantism in Catholic countries in Europe. We are now converting thousands annually. The cause of Protestantism is onward in those countries now; but let us set the example of proscriptions here, let us ostracise the Catholic, let us be the first to begin religious intolerance; and, sir, in every Catholic country in Europe would the iron heel of despotism at once be placed upon the heads of Protestants, and the great cause of Protestantism would be rolled back at once for a

thousand years. In the name, then, of Protestantism I protest against the unwise, unjust, impolitic, and suicidal principles and policy of the Know Nothing party.

But they say that Catholics have persecuted Protestants; and they refer to the bloody tragedy and massacre of St. Bartholomew's day, and other days of persecution and massacre, in the dark ages of the world, and under monarchical forms of government. This I admit. I admit that Catholics have persecuted Protestants, and Protestants have persecuted Catholics, in the dark ages of the world, and under arbitrary and monarchical Governments, and I condemn it, on all sides, as cruel, inhuman, and anti-Christian.

But, sir, because Catholics did wrong then, is that any reason we should do wrong now? Because Catholics persecuted Protestants in the dark ages of the world, under monarchical Governments, is that any reason Protestants should now persecute Catholics in the most enlightened age and in the freest Government upon earth? Because Catholics then, at the point of the bayonet, were driven to the persecution and massacre of Protestants, to satiate the bloodthirsty ambition of some reigning prince, is that any reason that Protestants now, in this free and happy land, should, of their own free *will* and *choice*, commence the same cruel work of incipient persecution and massacre? None, sir; none whatever. If it was wrong in Catholics then, to persecute Protestants, it would be wrong in Protestants now, to persecute Catholics. God forbid that Protestants should ever be guilty of doing that which they condemn in others! God forbid that they should ever attempt to justify themselves in doing wrong, because others have done wrong! God forbid that Protestants should ever hold up the cruel actions of professed Christians of the dark ages and monarchical Governments, as worthy the imitation of Protestants, in this age of light and liberty! No, no, Mr. Chairman, we are governed now by a higher sense of justice—a more elevated morality and a purer Christianity. They were governed and controlled by the law of *might*—we by the law of *right*. They were controlled by the principle of *temporal*—we by the principle of *eternal good*. They were governed by the laws founded in the selfish ambition of *men*—we by the laws founded in the wisdom and goodness of *God*. They adopted the principles taught by the King temporal—we the principles taught by the King eternal.

Talk, sir, about proscribing a man on account of his religion! There is nothing so revolting to my feelings, so violative of the great essential principles of Protestant Christianity. You cannot change a man's religious faith by proscription or persecution: it has been tried. Look at the great Apostle Peter, who, when he was being crucified at Rome on the rack, and tortured by piercing his body with red hot spits, at the bidding of the cruel and relentless Emperor, to make him renounce his faith in Jesus of Nazareth. Hear him, in the midst of his tortures, and last expiring throes, still exclaim that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God." You cannot change a man's religious faith; and it is wrong to attempt to proscribe him on account of it. You may take the body, chain, fetter, treat it as you will—spit upon it, trample it under your feet; it is but dust—mortal; but leave, oh! leave the mind, the eternal spirit, free to commune as it will with the God that gave it; it is immortal.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am no Catholic. I am neither a Catholic nor a foreigner. I am a native by birth, and a member of a Protestant church, and have been for nearly twenty-five years. I am, sir, of native-born Protestant parents—was raised a Protestant, and taught to disbelieve, and do disbelieve, the dogmas of the Catholic church.

But, sir, I am not called upon, as a religionist, to sit in judgment upon the tenets or dogmas of the Catholic creed, to approve or disapprove them. That is not my position; that is a question purely between the Catholic and his God, and with which I have nothing to do. I am called upon, in my representative and legislative capacity, to vindicate the Constitution of my country, and maintain and defend the rights secured and guarantied by that Constitution to every citizen in the Government, whether native-born or naturalized, Protestant or Roman Catholic. And, as far as my feeble ability will enable me, I intend to do it, without favor or affection.

I have now said all I have to say about the specific doctrines of Know Nothingism. A word now about Black Republicanism.

About this party, Mr. Chairman, and its principles, I have but little to say. They have but one distinctive idea, and that is, opposition to slavery—a war, and a war of ultimate extermination, against the peculiar institutions of the South. They first assume that slavery is not known to the Constitution, and, consequently, there is no obligation resting upon them to protect the right of property in slaves at any time, in any place, or in any manner. But when shown that the Constitution not only recognizes slavery, but actually tolerated the slave trade for a term of years, and that provision is made in the Constitution for the rendition of fugitive slaves, and that only three fifths of that portion of the population of the South should be counted in the apportionment of representation—when shown that all the States in the Union but one, at the time the Constitution was adopted, were slave States, and that the Constitution was made by slaveholders, and for the express purpose of better securing their property, and defending and maintaining their rights—why, sir, when shown all this, and satisfied of its truth, they fly off and say slavery is wrong in the abstract, and ought not to be tolerated—it is a violation of the laws of God—a sin in the sight of Heaven, and shall not be tolerated. Well, sir, when they are then shown that there is not a solitary passage in our old-fashioned family Bibles, from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Revelations, that prohibits slavery, or says one man shall not own property in another—that God, through Moses, authorized the Jews to purchase and hold slaves forever; that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had hosts of slaves while in full fellowship with God; that slavery has existed in every age of the world since the flood, patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian; that it was known, approved, and provided for by God the Father in the institution of the passover and circumcision; that it was seen, justified, and regulated by God the Son in the institution of baptism and the Lord's supper; that it never was censured, condemned, or interdicted under the old

dispensation by prophet, priest, or king—nor under the new by apostle, elder, or deacon; when shown all this, and convinced and driven to the wall on this point, they fly off, and say, "Well, if you had not passed the Kansas-Nebraska bill, we might have gotten on perhaps for awhile longer tolerably well without much trouble; but you have passed that *infamous* bill, and repealed the *glorious Missouri compromise line*, and we intend now to make a clean sweep of you; we intend to have no more slave States—no more slave Presidents; we intend to take the Government into our own hands—thus far shalt thou come and no further; we intend to restore the Missouri compromise, and make Kansas free; apply the Wilmot proviso, and forever close the doors to slavery in the Territories; repeal, or not execute, the fugitive slave law; restrict slavery to the States where it now exists; and finally, when we get the power, abolish it altogether."

Now, sir, this is the ground the Black Republicans assume, and the reason, they say, is, the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill. They say that the passage of this bill is the cause of the present agitation in the country. If so, sir, what was the cause of the agitation in 1820? There was no Missouri compromise repealed then: still the whole country was convulsed with the slavery agitation. What was the cause of the agitation in 1849–50? There was no Missouri compromise line repealed then: still the whole country was in a perfect state of frenzy about the slavery agitation, and the wisest heads and strongest hearts trembled for the safety of the Republic. Yet there was no Missouri compromise repealed, or proposed to be repealed, then. The proposition, then, from the South, was to abide by the Missouri compromise line, and to extend it in the like good faith in which it was originally adopted—to the Pacific ocean—and stop all agitation, and forever put to rest this vexed question of slavery. But these same men—these very identical men, who are now making so much *fuss* about a repeal of the Missouri compromise line, are the men—ah! sir, the very men, who then opposed that line, and swore that not another State, either north or south of it, should ever come into the Union as a slave State; thus repudiating the line altogether and forever. Yes, these very same men who repudiated it then are now the most clamorous about its repeal. Yes, sir, in 1848 these very men agitated, and said that this Missouri line was unjust, and had been imposed on the North by the aggressive policy of the South, and they would not observe it—they would not carry it out. In 1854–55–56 they again agitate, and say it has been repealed by the aggressive policy of the South, without their consent, and they will not stand it. They denounced it in 1848 as *infamous* and *invalid*. They laud it in 1854–55–56 as *glorious* and *inviolable;* that it was an aggression upon the North to pass it; that it is an aggression upon the North to repeal it; that the South is always aggressive—encroaching upon the North; that the North has been driven to agitation in self-defense. This is the position assumed by the Black Republican party, and this the sort of subterfuge they resort to to justify themselves before the country.

Now, sir, nothing can be more unreasonable than these complaints of the North against the South about the aggressive policy of slavery. They allege that the South has encroached, and is constantly endeavoring to encroach, upon the North in the maintenance of slavery. Let us examine, Mr. Chairman, the history of the subject, and ascertain how far the facts sustain the allegation.

To say nothing of the extent and influence of slavery, so far as the original thirteen States are concerned, I will begin with the Northwestern Territory belonging to the State of Virginia. This was slave territory, but, by a condition attending the cession of this territory to the Federal Government, it became free territory, out of which five free States have since been made, adding to the strength of the North, and weakening the slave power of the Union—increasing northern territory three-fold, and reducing southern nearly one half. In 1783, at the conclusion of peace, the States then north of Mason and Dixon's line had 164,081 square miles; the States then south of that line had 647,202 square miles. This surrender of the South, and this accession to the North, increased the northern territory to 425,761 square miles, and reduced the southern to 385,521 square miles. What next?

The whole of the Louisiana Territory was, when we purchased it, slave territory by the local laws. Upon the application of Missouri, (a part of this territory,) to be admitted as a State into the Union, the North objected, unless she would provide by her constitution to abolish slavery. The question was compromised. I will only stop here to say, that it was unjustly and unconstitutionally compromised; but it was compromised, and slavery forever prohibited north and west of the northern and western boundaries of Missouri, and north of latitude 36° 30′ north. On which side was the encroachment in this case? It was on the side of the North; and the South, in an evil hour, yielded to the unjust and unconstitutional exaction, and lost a large territory, which she had a perfect right to claim for slave territory.

Again: when we were about to acquire Texas, it was objected that it was slave territory. By the local laws of Texas slavery did exist there. But she was admitted into the Union only upon condition that slavery should forever be prohibited in all that part of the Territory lying north of 36° 30′. Here, sir, is another encroachment of the North upon southern rights.

Again, Mr. Chairman, Oregon, including what is now the Territory of Washington, was originally slave territory. Yet by the law organizing a territorial government for Oregon, slavery was prohibited there. And thus another instance of encroachment of the North upon the South, while not a single instance of southern encroachment upon the North can be adduced—not one.

To sum it all up in round numbers, the States north of Mason and Dixon's line, since 1783, by all the different cessions, adjustments, and compromises, have increased from 164,081 to 1,903,204 square miles, having added to their territorial limits 1,738,123 square miles; while the southern States have increased from 647,202 to 882,253 square miles, having added but 235,043 square miles to their territorial limits; showing that,

while the North has increased in territorial limits about twelve hundred per cent., the South, in the same time, has increased a little less than fifty per cent. And yet they say the South is aggressive, and always has been.

What else, sir? By a solemn compact embraced in the organic law of this Federal Union, without which the Union itself never could have been formed, the northern States bound themselves to deliver up fugitive slaves. They have not only disregarded this solemn obligation, but in some instances have enacted positive laws to prohibit its execution. I have shown you the instances in which the North have encroached upon the South. Here is one instance of broken faith on the part of the North with the South. The next is in the non-observance and repudiation of the Missouri compromise line as a principle of adjustment upon the slavery question, so *unjustly* and *unconstitutionally* forced upon the South by the North in the first instance.

In 1820, as I have stated, the North imposed upon the South the Missouri restriction unjustly and in violation of the Constitution; but in an evil hour the South agreed to accept it as an adjustment of the then pending difficulties upon the subject of slavery. Well, sir, when Texas was annexed in 1845, and the question was again raised about slavery, the South, true to her understanding of the Missouri compromise as a principle of adjustment, proposed, for the same reason that they had agreed to the line in 1820, to extend it through Texas to her western border and cut herself off from slave territory, which she then had and to which she was justly entitled. Well, sir, it was agreed to, and the North got the benefit of it.

What next? In 1848, at the conclusion of the Mexican war, and by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, we acquired a large tract of country, now known as California, Utah, and New Mexico. Territorial governments had to be organized for them; and the question, "How shall it be done, so as to do justice to the North and South?" was raised. The South again, true to her understanding of the Missouri compromise line, for the same reasons which had induced its adoption in 1820, proposed to extend it to the Pacific ocean, and thus divide the newly-acquired territory equitably, as they thought, between the North and the South, upon the basis of the Missouri line, which the North had originally forced upon the South against her will, and thus to put to rest forever the slavery agitation, which, unhappily, had so long disturbed the repose of the country. Well, in conformity to this view of the South, Mr. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, in 1848, offered a bill in the Senate to extend the line of 36° 30′ to the Pacific ocean. The Senate agreed to it, and passed the bill; but when it was sent to this House, the same party that is now making so much noise in the country rejected it with great contempt. They turned round, and run Mr. Van Buren for the Presidency upon the Buffalo platform, declaring that not another slave State should ever be admitted into the Union, either *north* or *south* of the Missouri compromise line. Thus, by their votes in this House against the Senate bill, and their votes for Mr. Van Buren for the Presidency, they repudiated and wiped out forever, as far as they are concerned, the line of 36° 30′; and they stand to-day completely estopped from all cause of complaint against Congress for repealing the Missouri compromise line by the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, because they, by two solemn acts, (the one the vote against the Senate bill, the other the vote for Mr. Van Buren for the Presidency,) had repealed the same line six years before. They have no right now to complain of Congress for doing that which they themselves had done six years previous.

Mr. PURVIANCE. I wish to ask the gentleman, for whom those votes now go that were cast for Mr. Van Buren then?

Mr. TALBOTT. I cannot tell. Mr. Van Buren, I understand, has seen the error of his way, and will vote for Mr. Buchanan. And it would be well if all those who voted for Mr. Van Buren in 1848 would repent of their sins and go and do likewise. I only regret that they do not do so. If they would, it would give repose to the country, and stability to the Union.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is the condition in which Congress and the country were left from 1848 to 1850. A large tract of country had been acquired from Mexico; it was filling up rapidly, and territorial governments were needed for the whole. The slavery agitation was shaking the Government to its center; the Missouri compromise stood repudiated by the North; no mode of adjustment hitherto adopted and sanctioned by the country seemed practicable; and Congress had to devise some new plan of adjustment to avert the impending storm, which seemed to be gathering everywhere for our destruction. Well, after nearly two years of hard labor, amid the deepest excitement, by the exertion of the wisest and best men we had, the plan of non-intervention, as indicated in the compromise measures of 1850, was recommended and adopted. Well, sir, the slavery agitation ceased; the country was quieted; the measures of 1850 were approved by everybody and by every section; the more the principle of non-intervention was investigated, the more popular and acceptable it seemed to be. Every one who looked at it and investigated it, saw at once that it was only carrying out the great principle upon which our Government is based—man's right and capability of self-government. They saw at once that it was only extending to the Territories precisely the same privileges which are now, and have been since the Government was first organized, enjoyed by every State in the Union. And, in 1852, the Whig party and the Democratic party both met in national convention, and indorsed the principles of non-intervention, which had been so adopted in lieu of the Missouri restriction, in spirit and in substance. We come, then, up to 1854, with this principle of non-intervention, in lieu of the Missouri restriction, adopted by Congress, in 1850—adopted by all parties again in 1852, and approved by the country everywhere. Kansas and Nebraska were knocking at the door of Congress for territorial bills. Well, California was being rapidly settled. Our people, North, South, East, and West, seemed determined to go in search of gold. There was no land route from the North, East, and West,

but through Nebraska. It was then, I think, a fine of $1,000 and six months' imprisonment, for any man to be found traveling or trading, without permission, in the Indian country. Notwithstanding the law of fines and penalties, our people were rushing by thousands constantly across this Indian country. Many fell victims to the tomahawk and scalping-knife of the merciless savages. Something had to be done; a remedy, as far as may be, had to be applied. All agreed to this; all agreed that Kansas ought to have a territorial organization; but what to do in regard to slavery, was the question raised.

Now, I contend that there was but one alternative left. The Missouri compromise stood repudiated by the North, formally, as a principle; locally, and in a governmental point of view, the non-intervention principle had been adopted in lieu, and because the North would not suffer the Missouri line to be carried out. Washington Territory had been organized about eight months after the passage of the compromise of 1850, on the principle of non-intervention. Two portions of this same Nebraska Territory had been incorporated in the territorial bills of 1850. The one portion into the territorial bill of New Mexico, and the other into the territorial bill of Utah upon the same principle of non-intervention. All parties, and all the people, in all the sections of the Union, had approved the action of Congress in the premises, and I hold that there was no alternative left for Congress but to do precisely what she did do. If it was right to apply the principle of non-intervention to a part of the Nebraska Territory, as in the case of Utah and New Mexico, it was right to apply it likewise in the case of Kansas and Nebraska; and Congress could not have done otherwise, without repudiating what it did in 1850, in the adoption of the non-intervention principle—without repudiating what both the great political parties did in the national conventions, in 1852—without repudiating even the action of the very men who are now so noisy about the repeal of the Missouri restriction; for they, as I said before, had repudiated the same line six years previous, by their own votes in this House, and at the polls. Now, sir, I say that, in view of all these facts, Congress could not have done otherwise than pass the Kansas and Nebraska bill just as it is. It is just, constitutional, and right; it neither legislates slavery into, nor excludes it from, the Territories, but leaves the people thereof perfectly free to organize their own governments and regulate their own domestic institutions for themselves. If, Mr. Chairman, the people are capable of self-government, who in our country will say they ought not to do it? If they have the right, who will say they shall not do it? If, then, they have both the capacity and the right, in reason's name, in the name of justice and our glorious Constitution, let them do it.

Mr. Chairman, near three quarters of a century have elapsed since the organization of our Government under our present excellent Federal Constitution. Since that time, life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness, have been equally secured to, and enjoyed by, every citizen in the country, native-born and naturalized, Protestant and Roman Catholic. We have been the most peaceful, prosperous, and happy people in the world. We have made the rapid and unparalleled growth of from three to near thirty millions in population, of from thirteen to thirty-one States, with territory sufficient for from ten to twenty more of equal average size with the present. We have advanced from poverty to wealth, from weakness to strength, from greatness to glory. Our ships plow every ocean; our sails whiten every sea; our commerce extends to every civilized nation upon earth; and our power and influence are felt and respected by every kingdom and empire in the world. Our past has been a most brilliant—a most glorious career. The God of nature and of nations seems to have marked us for his own. He has not only been good, but *very good* to us. He has blessed us in our house, and in our store; in our people, and in our rulers; in our foreign, and in our domestic relations. Everything that a good Government wisely administered—everything that science, literature, and religion—everything that agriculture, commerce, and manufactures—everything, in short, sir, that human wisdom, human energy, and human effort, crowned with the blessing of an omnipotent, omniscient, and beneficent Creator could accomplish, has been by us most gloriously achieved in the past. Yes, sir; and aside from the internal feuds, excited by the clamor for Know Nothingism and Black Republicanism, we stand to day, with all our population, white and black, bond and free, native-born and naturalized—with all our religions, Protestant and Roman Catholic—and with all our institutions, political, social, and domestic, the freest and happiest, the most peaceful and prosperous, and the most powerful and influential nation upon the face of the green, broad earth!

What more could we have done—what more could we have desired to do? What more could we enjoy—what more could we desire to enjoy—than what we now possess? Surely we would prove ourselves ungrateful to ask, and unworthy to receive, if we were to ask more than has been so graciously and so bountifully conferred upon us. This is a true picture—a faithful history of our past. And how, let me ask you, and through what human instrumentalities, has all this been effected? It has not been by the Know Nothing or Black Republican parties, nor by Know Nothing or Black Republican principles—not by the declaration, that freedom was national, and slavery sectional—not by declaring and enforcing the doctrine of no more slave States, and the non-rendition of fugitive slaves—not by getting up new tests of birth and blood, and religion, for office, unknown to, and violative of, the Constitution—not by getting up a war of races and religions, drawing invidious distinctions between the native-born and naturalized, the Protestant and Roman Catholic, citizen—not by getting up secret, oath-bound political organizations, and swearing their members to vote for no man, for any office in the Government, State or National, from the highest to the lowest, unless he be a native-born American citizen, in favor of Americans ruling America, nor if he be a Roman Catholic. No, Mr. Chairman, it was not by any instrumentalities of this sort, that these great ends have been achieved. How, then, and by what

human instrumentalities, has it all been done? By the old Whig and the old Democratic parties, directed by the unseen but unerring hand of a kind Providence, and through the instrumentalities of our glorious Constitution and Union as they are.

These new parties, and these wild and impracticable principles, were unknown in the days of our Revolution. They were not taught, nor would they have been tolerated if they had been taught, in the days of Washington and Jefferson. They dare not show their heads in the days of Monroe or Madison, Calhoun or Jackson, Clay or Webster. I know that the Know Nothings assert that Washington said foreigners would not do to trust —you must keep "none but Americans on guard to-night." I know they read scraps and pieces taken from mutilated letters and documents of Washington and Jefferson, and try to make it appear that they were in favor of Know Nothingism as now taught. But, sir, here [holding up the Constitution of the United States] are all the letters, or the embodiment of all the letters, of Washington and Jefferson, in regard to naturalized citizens and Roman Catholics. This book, (the Constitution,) this blessed book, contains the last will and testament of the Father of his Country, superintended by himself in person; and when he was satisfied it was *all right, then, but not till then*, he put his own *great name* to it, written by his *own right arm*. It contains all his wishes, all his opinions, all his acts, upon all these subjects. And in this book—this great, this good book, there is nothing said, not even a word, about freedom being national and slavery sectional; nothing about the Catholic religion being wrong and the Protestant religion right; nothing about native citizens being worthy and naturalized citizens unworthy; nothing, in all its length and breadth, that requires a man to abandon his property in slaves before he can settle in any of the Territories in the Union; nothing, sir, that requires a man to swear "that he will not vote for any man, for any office, State or national, unless he be a native-born American citizen, in favor of Americans ruling America; nor if he be a Roman Catholic." Nothing—nothing of this sort in all the length and breadth of that great book. It breathes a very different spirit. It breathes the spirit that Martin Luther breathed when he raised his *godlike voice* in favor of the freedom of religion and the *equality* of rights. It leaves religion free, unrestrained, and unrestrainable. It leaves the rights of all equal and inviolable. It knows no North, no South, no East, no West, as such, but all—all are *equally* included and protected by its ample provisions. Is it not, then, Mr. Chairman, a glorious book? Is it not a wise and equitable will? Does it not contain a rich and glorious legacy? And should we not venerate it, and rally around it, and defend it against all aggression, innovation, or infraction, come from what quarter it may?

Let us, then, with the most profound respect and veneration, rally around this instrument, as containing the last will and testament of the Father of his Country; in which he has bequeathed to each and every of us, his legitimate political offspring, equal rights and equal privileges—civil, social, political, and religious Let us, too, rally around the two old political parties, who, with such firmness and faithfulness, have maintained and preserved that good book, with all its glorious provisions, against the assaults of every foe. Let us stand by them and their time-honored principles, which, under the blessing of a kind Providence, have enabled them to conduct us so safely, so peacefully, and so unerringly, to the high and enviable position we now occupy. Let us, sir, in view of the present crisis—forgetting all former political ties—to save our country and our institutions, abandon the unwise, the unjust, and suicidal policy of Know Nothingism and Black Republicanism, and return to the time-honored principles and policy of our fathers. If we will, the fierce, fiery, stormy agitation now raging on our northern border would soon be abated—sectional jealousy and sectional hate soon allayed—the Constitution maintained intact—the glorious union of the States preserved as they are—all cause of strife removed—freedom of religion and equality of rights enjoyed by every citizen and every section—the North and the South could strike hands together—the East and West embrace each other—and America, our fatherland, our beloved America, would never cease to be "the land of the free and the home of the brave!"

Printed at the Office of the Congressional Globe.

W46

WERT
BOOKBINDING
Grantsville, Pa.
Jan - Feb 1989
We're Quality Bound